pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first.

SEC.2. The Majority Leader of the Senate and the Speaker of the House, acting jointly after consultation with the Minority Leader of the Senate and the Minority Leader of the House, shall notify the Members of the Senate and House, respectively, to reassemble whenever, in their opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 24—TO EXPRESS THE SENSE OF CONGRESS ON THE NEED FOR THE UNITED STATES TO DEFEND THE AMERICAN AGRICULTURAL AND FOOD SUPPLY SYSTEM FROM INDUSTRIAL SABOTAGE AND TERRORIST THREATS

Mr. LUGAR submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry:

S. CON. RES. 24

Whereas the President has begun to implement programs to protect the critical infrastructures of the United States from attack;

Whereas the American agricultural and food supply system, a highly technological and efficient system for growing, processing, distributing, and marketing food and other agricultural products for the world market, is vulnerable to threats and attacks, particularly threats and attacks employing weapons, technologies, and materials of mass destruction;

Whereas the American agricultural and food supply system has not been included in counterterrorism planning;

Whereas critical infrastructure protection efforts must include response planning for potential threats and attacks on the American agricultural and food supply system;

Whereas the Department of Agriculture must play an active role in the coun terterrorism and critical infrastructure preparedness plans of the United States; and

Whereas a successful strategy for protection of the American agricultural and food supply system must also include cooperation with State and local authorities and the private sector: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the United States should take steps that are necessary to protect the American agricultural and food supply system from attacks, particularly attacks employing weapons, technologies, and materials of mass destruction; and

(2) the Department of Agriculture should take the lead in protecting the American agricultural and food supply system.

SENATE RESOLUTION 75—RECONSTITUTING THE SENATE ARMS CONTROL OBSERVER GROUP AS THE SENATE NATIONAL SECURITY WORKING GROUP AND REVISING THE AUTHORITY OF THE GROUP

Mr. LOTT submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 75

Resolved, That Senate Resolution 105 of the One Hundred First Congress, agreed to April 13, 1989, as amended by Senate Resolution 149 of the One Hundred Third Congress, agreed to October 5, 1993, is further amended as follows:

(1) In subsection (a) of the first section, by striking paragraph (1) and inserting the following:

''(1) the Senate Arms Control Observer Group, which was previously constituted and authorized by the authority described in paragraph (2), is hereby reconstituted and reauthorized as the Senate National Security Working Group (hereafter in this resolution referred to as the 'Working Group').''.

(2) By striking ''Observer Group'' each place it appears in the resolution, except paragraph (3) of subsection (a) of the first section, and inserting ''Working Group''.

(3) By striking ''Group'' in the second sentence of section 3(a) and inserting ''Working Group''.

(4) By striking paragraph (3) of subsection (a) of the first section and inserting the following:,

''(3)(A) The members of the Working Group shall act as official observers on the United States delegation to any negotiations, to which the United States is a party, on any of the following:

''(i) Reduction, limitation, or control of conventional weapons, weapons of mass destruction, or the means for delivery of any such weapons.

''(ii) Reduction, limitation, or control of missile defenses.

''(iii) Export controls.

''(B) In addition, the Working Group is encouraged to consult with legislators of foreign nations, including the members of the State Duma and Federal Council of the Russian Federation and, as appropriate, legislators of other foreign nations, regarding matters described in subparagraph (A).

''(C) The Working Group is not authorized to investigate matters relating to espionage or intelligence operations against the United States, counterintelligence operations and activities, or other intelligence matters within the jurisdiction of the Select Committee on Intelligence under Senate Resolution 400 of the Ninety-Fourth Congress, agreed to on May 19, 1976.''.

(5) In paragraph (4) of subsection (a) of the first section—

(A) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) by striking ''Five'' in the matter preceding clause (i) and inserting ''Seven'';

(ii) by striking ''two'' in clause (ii) and inserting ''three''; and

(iii) by striking ''two'' in clause (iii) and inserting ''three'';

(B) in subparagraph (C), by striking ''Six'' and inserting ''Five''; and

(C) in subparagraph (D), by striking ''Seven'' and inserting ''Six''.

(6) In section 2(b)(3), by striking ''five''.

(7) In the second sentence of section 3(a)—

(A) by striking ''$380,000'' and inserting ''$500,000''; and

(B) by striking ''except that not more than'' and inserting ''of which not more than''.

(8) By striking section 4.

(9) By amending the title to read as follows: ''Resolution reconstituting the Senate Arms Control Observer Group as the Senate National Security Working Group, and revising the authority of the Group.''.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2000

ROTH (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 176

Mr. ROTH (for himself, Mr. BREAUX, Mr. FRIST, Mr. KERREY, Mr. GRAMM, Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. NICKLES, Mr. THOMPSON, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. HATCH, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. MACK, Mr. MURKOWSKI, Mr. GRAMS, and Mr. ASHCROFT) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 20) setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal years 2000 through 2009; as follows:

At the end of title III, insert the following:

SEC. ___. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING THE MODERNIZATION AND IMPROVEMENT OF THE MEDICARE PROGRAM.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds the following:

(1) The health insurance coverage provided under the medicare program under title XVIII of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395 et seq.) is an integral part of the financial security for retired and disabled individuals, as such coverage protects those individuals against the financially ruinous costs of a major illness.

(2) Expenditures under the medicare program for hospital, physician, and other essential health care services that are provided to nearly 39,000,000 retired and disabled individuals will be $232,000,000,000 in fiscal year 2000.

(3) During the nearly 35 years since the medicare program was established, the Nation's health care delivery and financing system has undergone major transformations. However, the medicare program has not kept pace with such transformations.

(4) Former Congressional Budget Office Director Robert Reischauer has described the medicare program as it exists today as failing on the following 4 key dimensions (known as the ''Four I's''):

(A) The program is inefficient.

(B) The program is inequitable.

(C) The program is inadequate.

(D) The program is insolvent.

(5) The President's budget framework does not devote 15 percent of the budget surpluses to the medicare program. The federal budget process does not provide a mechanism for setting aside current surpluses for future obligations. As a result, the notion of saving 15 percent of the surplus for the medicare program cannot practically be carried out.

(6) The President's budget framework would transfer to the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund more than $900,000,000,000 over 15 years in new IOUs that must be redeemed later by raising taxes on American workers, cutting benefits, or borrowing more from the public, and these new IOUs would increase the gross debt of the Federal Government by the amounts transferred.

(7) The Congressional Budget Office has stated that the transfers described in paragraph (6), which are strictly intragovernmental, have no effect on the unified budget surpluses or the on-budget surpluses and therefore have no effect on the debt held by the public.

(8) The President's budget framework does not provide access to, or financing for, prescription drugs.

(9) The Comptroller General of the United States has stated that the President's medicare proposal does not constitute reform of the program and ''is likely to create a public misperception that something meaningful is being done to reform the Medicare program''.

(10) The Balanced Budget Act of 1997 enacted changes to the medicare program which strengthen and extend the solvency of that program.

(11) The Congressional Budget Office has stated that without the changes made to the medicare program by the Balanced Budget Act of 1997, the depletion of the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund would now be imminent.

(12) The President's budget proposes to cut medicare program spending by $19,400,000,000 over 10 years, primarily through reductions in payments to providers under that program.

(13) While the recommendations by Senator John Breaux and Representative William Thomas received the bipartisan support of a majority of members on the National Bipartisan Commission on the Future of Medicare, all of the President's appointees to that commission opposed the bipartisan reform plan.

(14) The Breaux-Thomas recommendations provide for new prescription drug coverage for the neediest beneficiaries within a plan that substantially improves the solvency of the medicare program without transferring new IOUs to the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund that must be redeemed later by raising taxes, cutting benefits, or borrowing more from the public.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the provisions contained in this budget resolution assume the following:

(1) This resolution does not adopt the President's proposals to reduce medicare program spending by $19,400,000,000 over 10 years, nor does this resolution adopt the President's proposal to spend $10,000,000,000 of medicare program funds on unrelated programs.

(2) Congress will not transfer to the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund new IOUs that must be redeemed later by raising taxes on American workers, cutting benefits, or borrowing more from the public.

(3) Congress should work in a bipartisan fashion to extend the solvency of the medicare program and to ensure that benefits under that program will be available to beneficiaries in the future.

(4) The American public will be well and fairly served in this undertaking if the medicare program reform proposals are considered within a framework that is based on the following 5 key principles offered in testimony to the Senate Committee on Finance by the Comptroller General of the United States:

(A) Affordability.

(B) Equity.

(C) Adequacy.

(D) Feasibility.

(E) Public acceptance.

(5) The recommendations by Senator Breaux and Congressman Thomas provide for new prescription drug coverage for the neediest beneficiaries within a plan that substantially improves the solvency of the medicare program without transferring to the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund new IOUs that must be redeemed later by raising taxes, cutting benefits, or borrowing more from the public.

(6) Congress should move expeditiously to consider the bipartisan recommendations of the Chairmen of the National Bipartisan Commission on the Future of Medicare.

(7) Congress should continue to work with the President as he develops and presents his plan to fix the problems of the medicare program.

KENNEDY AMENDMENT NO. 177

Mr. KENNEDY proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution, S. Con. Res. 20, supra; as follows:

Increase the levels of Federal revenues in section 101(1)(A) by the following amounts:

(1) Fiscal year 2000: $0.

(2) Fiscal year 2001: $3,000,000,000.

(3) Fiscal year 2002: $25,000,000,000.

(4) Fiscal year 2003: $13,000,000,000.

(5) Fiscal year 2004: $18,000,000,000.

(6) Fiscal year 2005: $31,000,000,000.

(7) Fiscal year 2006: $57,000,000,000.

(8) Fiscal year 2007: $58,000,000,000.

(9) Fiscal year 2008: $59,000,000,000.

(10) Fiscal year 2009: $56,000,000,000.

Change the levels of Federal revenues in section 101(1)(B) by the following amounts:

(1) Fiscal year 2000: $0;

(2) Fiscal year 2001: $3,000,000,000;

(3) Fiscal year 2002: $25,000,000,000;

(4) Fiscal year 2003: $13,000,000,000;

(5) Fiscal year 2004: $18,000,000,000;

(6) Fiscal year 2005: $31,000,000,000;

(7) Fiscal year 2006: $57,000,000,000;

(8) Fiscal year 2007: $58,000,000,000;

(9) Fiscal year 2008: $59,000,000,000; and

(10) Fiscal year 2009: $56,000,000,000.

Reduce the levels of total budget authority and outlays in section 101(2) and section 101(3) by the following amounts:

(1) Fiscal year 2000: $0;

(2) Fiscal year 2001: $0;

(3) Fiscal year 2002: $1,000,000,000;

(4) Fiscal year 2003: $2,000,000,000;

(5) Fiscal year 2004: $3,000,000,000;

(6) Fiscal year 2005: $4,000,000,000;

(7) Fiscal year 2006: $6,000,000,000;

(8) Fiscal year 2007: $10,000,000,000;

(9) Fiscal year 2008: $13,000,000,000; and

(10) Fiscal year 2009: $17,000,000,000.

Increase the levels of surpluses in section 101(4) by the following amounts:

(1) Fiscal year 2000: $0.

(2) Fiscal year 2001: $3,000,000,000.

(3) Fiscal year 2002: $26,000,000,000.

(4) Fiscal year 2003: $15,000,000,000.

(5) Fiscal year 2004: $21,000,000,000.

(6) Fiscal year 2005: $35,000,000,000.

(7) Fiscal year 2006: $63,000,000,000.

(8) Fiscal year 2007: $68,000,000,000.

(9) Fiscal year 2008: $72,000,000,000.

(10) Fiscal year 2009: $73,000,000,000.

Decrease the levels of public debt in section 101(5) by the following amounts:

(1) Fiscal year 2000: $0.

(2) Fiscal year 2001: $3,000,000,000.

(3) Fiscal year 2002: $26,000,000,000.

(4) Fiscal year 2003: $15,000,000,000.

(5) Fiscal year 2004: $21,000,000,000.

(6) Fiscal year 2005: $35,000,000,000.

(7) Fiscal year 2006: $63,000,000,000.

(8) Fiscal year 2007: $68,000,000,000.

(9) Fiscal year 2008: $72,000,000,000.

(10) Fiscal year 2009: $73,000,000,000.

Decrease the levels of debt held by the public in section 101(6) by the following amounts:

(1) Fiscal year 2000: $0.

(2) Fiscal year 2001: $3,000,000,000.

(3) Fiscal year 2002: $26,000,000,000.

(4) Fiscal year 2003: $15,000,000,000.

(5) Fiscal year 2004: $21,000,000,000.

(6) Fiscal year 2005: $35,000,000,000.

(7) Fiscal year 2006: $63,000,000,000.

(8) Fiscal year 2007: $68,000,000,000.

(9) Fiscal year 2008: $72,000,000,000.

(10) Fiscal year 2009: $73,000,000,000.

Decrease the levels of budget authority and outlays in section 103(18) for function 900, Net Interest, by the following amounts:

(1) Fiscal year 2000: $0.

(2) Fiscal year 2001: $0.

(3) Fiscal year 2002: $1,000,000,000.

(4) Fiscal year 2003: $2,000,000,000.

(5) Fiscal year 2004: $3,000,000,000.

(6) Fiscal year 2005: $4,000,000,000.

(7) Fiscal year 2006: $6,000,000,000.

(8) Fiscal year 2007: $10,000,000,000.

(9) Fiscal year 2008: $13,000,000,000.

(10) Fiscal year 2009: $17,000,000,000.

Reduce the levels in section 104(1) by which the Senate Committee on Finance is instructed to reduce revenues by the following amounts:

(1) $0 in fiscal year 2000.

(2) $59,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2000 through 2004.

(3) $320,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2000 through 2009.

On page 46, strike section 204.

At the end of title III, insert the following:

SEC. ___. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON EXTENDING THE SOLVENCY OF MEDICARE.

It is the sense of the Senate that the provisions of this resolution assume that the savings from the amendment reducing tax breaks for the wealthiest taxpayers should be reserved to strengthen and extend the solvency of the Medicare program.

DORGAN (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 178

Mr. DORGAN (for himself, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. CONRAD, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. KERREY, Mrs. LINCOLN, Mr. WELLSTONE, and Mr. LEAHY) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution, S. Con. Res. 20, supra; as follows:

On page 43, strike beginning with line 3 through line 6, page 45, and insert the following:

SEC. 201. RESERVE FUND FOR AN UPDATED BUDGET FORECAST.

(a) CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE UPDATED BUDGET FORECAST FOR FISCAL YEARS 2000–2004.—Pursuant to section 202(e)(2) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the Congressional Budget Office shall update its economic and budget forecast for fiscal years 2000 through 2004 by July 15, 1999.

(b) REPORTING A SURPLUS.—If the report provided pursuant to subsection (a) estimates an on-budget surplus for fiscal year 2000 or additional surpluses beyond those assumed in this resolution in following fiscal years, the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall make the appropriate adjustments to revenue and spending as provided in subsection (c).

(c) ADJUSTMENTS.—The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall take the amount of the on-budget surplus for fiscal years 2000 through 2004 estimated in the report submitted pursuant to subsection (a) and in the following order in each of the fiscal years 2000 through 2004—

(1) increase the allocation to the Senate Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition and Forestry by $6,000,000,000 in budget authority and outlays in each of the fiscal years 2000 through 2004;

(2) reduce the on-budget revenue aggregate by that amount for fiscal year 2000;

(3) provide for or increase the on-budget surplus levels used for determining compliance with the pay-as-you-go requirements of section 202 of H. Con. Res. 67 (104th Congress) by that amount for fiscal year 2000; and

(4) adjust the instruction in sections 104(1) and 105(1) of this resolution to—

(A) reduce revenues by that amount for fiscal year 2000; and

(B) increase the reduction in revenues for the period of fiscal years 2000 through 2004 and for the period of fiscal years 2000 through 2009 by that amount.

(d) BUDGETARY ENFORCEMENT.—Revised aggregates and other levels under subsection (c) shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as aggregates and other levels contained in this resolution.

SEC. 202. RESERVE FUND FOR AGRICULTURE.

(a) ADJUSTMENT.—If legislation is reported by the Senate Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition and Forestry that provides risk management and income assistance for agriculture producers, the Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may increase the allocation of budget authority and outlays to that Committee by an amount that does not exceed—

(1) $6,500,000,000 in budget authority and in outlays for fiscal year 2000;

(2) $36,000,000,000 in budget authority and $35,165,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2000 through 2004; and

(3) $36,000,000,000 in budget authority and in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2000 through 2009.

MCCAIN AMENDMENTS NOS. 179–181

(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Mr. MCCAIN submitted three amendments intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution, S. Con. Res. 20, supra; as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 179

At the end of title III, insert the following:

SEC. ___. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON SOCIAL SECURITY EARNINGS TEST.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) the Social Security Earnings Test is unfair and discriminates against America's senior citizens;

(2) low-income senior citizens who do not have significant savings or a private pension plan are hit hardest by the Social Security earnings test while wealthier senior citizens are not affected by this unfair penalty;

(3) according to the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, ''retaining older workers is a priority in labor intensive industries, and will become even more critical as we approach the year 2000'' and yet our Nation foolishly prevents diligent, knowledgeable and experienced workers out of the American work force just because they are 65 years old;

(4) our laws should encourage work, not discourage individual productivity; and

(5) eliminating the earnings test and permitting our Nation's elderly to work and improve their standard of living will also help increase our national prosperity.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution assume that—

(1) the Social Security earnings test should be repealed immediately; and

(2) the Senate Finance Committee should include a full repeal of the Social Security Earnings Test in any Social Security reform legislation.

● Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, today I am offering an amendment to the Budget Resolution which would help our nation's senior citizens by requiring the repeal of the Social Security earnings test.

As many of my colleagues know, the Social Security earnings test penalizes Americans between the ages of 65 and 70 for working and remaining productive after retirement. Under this unfair law, a senior citizen loses $1 of Social Security benefits for every $3 earned over the established limit, which is $15,500 in 1999.

Due to this cap on earnings, our senior citizens are burdened with a 33.3 percent tax on their earned income. Combined with Federal, State, local and other Social Security taxes, this amounts to an outrageous 55 to 65 percent tax bite, and sometimes it can be even higher.

What is most disturbing about the earnings test is the tremendous burden it places upon our low-income senior citizens. Most of the older Americans penalized by the earnings test need to work in order to cover basic expenses: food, housing and health care. Our nation's low-income seniors are hit hardest by the earnings test, while most wealthy seniors escape unscathed. This is because supplemental ''unearned'' income from stocks, investments and savings is not affected by the earnings test.

This is simply wrong and must be stopped.

In 1996, Congress took a step in the right direction when we passed the ''Senior Citizens Right to Work Act'' increasing the earnings threshold for senior citizens from $11,520 to $30,000 by the year 2002. I was proud to be the sponsor of this legislation which helped alleviate the unfair economic penalties placed on hard working senior citizens.

While raising the limit was important it is time that we finally eliminate the Social Security earnings test and permit our nation's elderly to work and improve their standard of living while increasing our national prosperity.●

AMENDMENT NO. 180

At the end of title III, insert the following:

SEC. ___. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON SOCIAL SECURITY EARNINGS TEST.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) the Social Security Earnings Test is unfair and discriminates against America's senior citizens;

(2) low-income senior citizens who do not have significant savings or a private pension plan are hit hardest by the Social Security earnings test while wealthier senior citizens are not affected by this unfair penalty;

(3) according to the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, ''retaining older workers is a priority in labor intensive industries, and will become even more critical as we approach the year 2000'' and yet our Nation foolishly prevents diligent, knowledgeable and experienced workers out of the American work force just because they are 65 years old;

(4) our laws should encourage work, not discourage individual productivity; and

(5) eliminating the earnings test and permitting our Nation's elderly to work and improve their standard of living will also help increase our national prosperity.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution assume that—

(1) the Social Security earnings test should be repealed immediately; and

(2) the Senate Finance Committee should include a full repeal of the Social Security Earnings Test in any Social Security reform legislation.

AMENDMENT NO. 181

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. ___. BUDGET FOR EMBASSY SECURITY.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) terrorism, both foreign and domestic, poses a grave threat to United States interests abroad and to the well-being of United States citizens at home;

(2) since the bombing of United States Embassies in Lebanon and Kuwait in 1983 and the truck bomb destruction of the United States facility in Saudi Arabia in 1996, the issue of physical security of United States diplomatic missions and military facilities abroad has been a growing concern to the United States Government and to the public it represents;

(3) the August 1998 bombings of the United States Embassies in Nairobi, Kenya, and Dar es Salaam, Tanzania, further illuminated the vulnerability of United States diplomatic missions to acts of terrorism directed against the United States;

(4) the report of the Secretary of State's Advisory Panel on Overseas Security of June 1985 specified certain measures that the United States should take to reduce the prospects of repeated bombings of United States Embassies abroad such as occurred in Lebanon and Kuwait in 1983;

(5) the Accountability Review Boards chaired by Admiral William J. Crowe, Jr. warned of continuing vulnerabilities to United States diplomatic missions cause by the failure of the United States Government to take necessary actions to reduce that vulnerability;

(6) the Accountability Review Boards recommended that the United States Government allocate the sum of $15,000,000,000 be spent over 10 years to address the vulnerabilities of United States diplomatic missions abroad; and

(7) the Administration has budgeted less than half the amount recommended by the Accountability Review Boards for improving the security of United States diplomatic missions abroad.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that budget levels in this concurrent resolution assume that—

(1) the President should propose a budget for embassy security consistent with the recommendations set forth by the Accountability Review Boards and including measures recommended by the 1985 Advisory Panel on Overseas Security; and

(2) the Secretary of State should provide Congress within 60 days of adoption of this concurrent resolution a comprehensive report on the Secretary's plans for implementing the recommendations of the Accountability Review Boards and the 1985 Advisory Panel on Overseas Security.

● Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, I rise today to offer an amendment to the Budget Resolution that expresses the sense of Congress that the President should propose a budget for embassy security consistent with the recommendations set forth by the Accountability Review Boards, otherwise known as the Crowe Commission, and include measures recommended by the 1985 Advisory Panel on Overseas Security, also known as the Inman Commission. It further directs the Secretary of State to provide to Congress within 60 days of passage of the resolution a comprehensive report on its plans for implementing the recommendations of these two commissions.

Our embassies and consulates abroad are sovereign United States territory, representing our country's presence around the world, advancing our foreign policy interests, and protecting American citizens traveling overseas on business and pleasure. The people who work in and visit our embassies deserve a level of physical security commensurate with the threat they face from terrorist organizations and individuals seeking to express their hostility to the United States through destruction of the most visible symbol of U.S. global presence. Their destruction, as occurred in Beirut and Kuwait City in 1983 and in Nairobi and Dar es Salaam in 1998, as well as the targeting of other U.S. military and diplomatic facilities overseas, is a direct attack on the United States.

It is for this reason that the Administration's five-year budget proposal for embassy security is so disappointing and irresponsible. Representing less than one-half the amount recommended by the Crowe Commission, it sends a worrisome signal to our representatives around the world about how we view their physical well-being, and invites further attacks on soft targets. The threat of terrorist attack on our embassies is very real. Such attacks not only result in the death of U.S. and host country citizens, but also carry with them the potential for destabilization of countries in which the attack occurs. My amendment seeks to address the large disparity between what is required and what is provided. I urge my colleagues to support its passage.●

ROBB (AND GRAHAM) AMENDMENT NO. 182

Mr. ROBB (for himself and Mr. GRAHAM) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution, S. Con. Res. 20, supra; as follows:

On page 46, strike section 204.

On page 42, strike lines 1 through 5, and strike lines 15 through 19. Insert at the appropriate place the following:

SEC. . SENSE OF THE SENATE.

It is the sense of the Senate that the provisions of this resolution assume that the savings from this amendment shall be used to reduce publicly held debt and to strengthen and extend the solvency of the Medicare program.

LAUTENBERG (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 183

Mr. LAUTENBERG (for himself, Mr. ROBB, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. LEVIN, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. DODD, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mrs. MURRAY, Ms. LANDRIEU, and Mr. REID) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution, S. Con. Res. 20, supra; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. ___. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON MODERNIZING AMERICA'S SCHOOLS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds the following:

(1) The General Accounting Office has performed a comprehensive survey of the Nation's public elementary and secondary school facilities and has found severe levels of disrepair in all areas of the United States.

(2) The General Accounting Office has concluded that more than 14,000,000 children attend schools in need of extensive repair or replacement; 7,000,000 children attend schools with life safety code violations; and 12,000,000 children attend schools with leaky roofs.

(3) The General Accounting Office has found that the problem of crumbling schools transcends demographic and geographic boundaries. At 38 percent of urban schools, 30 percent of rural schools, and 29 percent of suburban schools, at least 1 building is in need of extensive repair or should be completely replaced.

(4) The condition of school facilities has a direct effect on the safety of students and teachers and on the ability of students to learn. Academic research has provided a direct correlation between the condition of school facilities and student achievement. At Georgetown University, researchers have found the test scores of students assigned to schools in poor condition can be expected to fall 10.9 percentage points below the test scores of students in buildings in excellent condition. Similar studies have demonstrated up to a 20 percent improvement in test scores when students were moved from a poor facility to a new facility.

(5) The General Accounting Office has found most schools are not prepared to incorporate modern technology in the classroom. 46 percent of schools lack adequate electrical wiring to support the full-scale use of technology. More than a third of schools lack the requisite electrical power. 56 percent of schools have insufficient phone lines for modems.

(6) The Department of Education has reported that elementary and secondary school enrollment, already at a record high level, will continue to grow over the next 10 years, and that in order to accommodate this growth, the United States will need to build an additional 6,000 schools.

(7) The General Accounting Office has determined that the cost of bringing schools up to good, overall condition to be $112,000,000,000, not including the cost of modernizing schools to accommodate technology, or the cost of building additional facilities needed to meet record enrollment levels.

(8) Schools run by the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) for Native American children are also in dire need of repair and renovation. The General Accounting Office has reported that the cost of total inventory repairs needed for BIA facilities is $754,000,000. The December 1997 report by the Comptroller General of the United States states that, ''Compared with other schools nationally, BIA schools are generally in poorer physical condition, have more unsatisfactory environmental factors, more often lack key facilities requirements for education reform, and are less able to support computer and communications technology.

(9) State and local financing mechanisms have proven inadequate to meet the challenges facing today's aging school facilities. Large numbers of local educational agencies have difficulties securing financing for school facility improvement.

(10) The Federal Government has provided resources for school construction in the past. For example, between 1933 and 1939, the Federal Government assisted in 70 percent of all new school construction.

(11) The Federal Government can support elementary and secondary school facilities without interfering in issues of local control, and should help communities leverage additional funds for the improvement of elementary and secondary school facilities.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the budgetary levels in this budget resolution assume that Congress will enact measures to assist school districts in modernizing their facilities, including—

(1) legislation to allow States and school districts to issue at least $24,800,000,000 worth of zero-interest bonds to rebuild and modernize our Nation's schools, and to provide Federal income tax credits to the purchasers of those bonds in lieu of interest payments; and

(2) appropriate funding for the Education Infrastructure Act of 1994 during the period 2000 through 2004, which would provide grants to local school districts for the repair, renovation and construction of public school facilities.

LAUTENBERG AMENDMENT NO. 184

Mr. LAUTENBERG proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution, S. Con. Res. 20, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. . BUDGET-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR ENVIRONMENTAL AND NATURAL RESOURCES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the Senate, revenue and spending aggregates and other appropriate budgetary levels and limits may be adjusted and allocations may be revised for legislation to improve the quality of our nation's air, water, land, and natural resources, provided that, to the extent that this concurrent resolution on the budget does not include the costs of that legislation, the enactment of that legislation will not (by virtue of either contemporaneous or previously-passed reinstatement or modification of expired excise or environmental taxes) increase the deficit or decrease the surplus for—

(1) fiscal year 2000;

(2) the period of fiscal years 2000 through 2004; or

(3) the period of fiscal years 2005 through 2009.

(b) REVISED ALLOCATIONS.—

(1) Adjustments for legislation.—Upon the consideration of legislation pursuant to subsection (a), the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may file with the Senate appropriately-revised allocations under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and revised functional levels and aggregates to carry out this section. These revised allocations, functional levels, and aggregates shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as allocations, functional levels, and aggregates contained in this resolution.

(2) Adjustments for amendments.—If the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate submits an adjustment under this section for legislation in furtherance of the purpose described in subsection (a), upon the offering of an amendment to that legislation that would necessitate such submission, the Chairman shall submit to the Senate appropriately-revised allocations under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and revised functional levels and aggregates to carry out this section. These revised allocations, functional levels, and aggregates shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as allocations, functional levels, and aggregates contained in this resolution.

(c) REPORTING REVISED ALLOCATIONS.—The appropriate committees shall report appropriately-revised allocations pursuant to section 302(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to carry out this section.

DURBIN (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 185

Mr. LAUTENBERG (for Mr. DURBIN for himself, Mr. BYRD, and Mr. DOMENICI) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution, S. Con. Res. 20, supra; as follows:

On page 47, strike section 205 and insert the following:

SEC. 205. EMERGENCY DESIGNATION POINT OF ORDER.

(a) DESIGNATIONS.—

(1) GUIDANCE.—In making a designation of a provision of legislation as an emergency requirement under section 251(b)(2)(A) or 252(e) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, the committee report and any statement of managers accompanying that legislation shall analyze whether a proposed emergency requirement meets all the criteria in paragraph (2).

(2) CRITERIA.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The criteria to be considered in determining whether a proposed expenditure or tax change is an emergency requirement are whether it is—

(i) necessary, essential, or vital (not merely useful or beneficial);

(ii) sudden, quickly coming into being, and not building up over time;

(iii) an urgent, pressing, and compelling need requiring immediate action;

(iv) subject to subparagraph (B), unforeseen, unpredictable, and unanticipated; and

(v) not permanent, temporary in nature.

(B) UNFORESEEN.—An emergency that is part of an aggregate level of anticipated emergencies, particularly when normally estimated in advance, is not unforeseen.

(3) JUSTIFICATION FOR FAILURE TO MEET CRITERIA.—If the proposed emergency requirement does not meet all the criteria set forth in paragraph (2), the committee report or the statement of managers, as the case may be, shall provide a written justification of why the requirement should be accorded emergency status.

(b) POINT OF ORDER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—When the Senate is considering a bill, resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report, upon a point of order being made by a Senator against any provision in that measure designated as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) or 252(e) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 and the Presiding Officer sustains that point of order, that provision along with the language making the designation shall be stricken from the measure and may not be offered as an amendment from the floor.

(2) GENERAL POINT OF ORDER.—A point of order under this subsection may be raised by a Senator as provided in section 313(e) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

(3) CONFERENCE REPORTS.—If a point of order is sustained under this subsection against a conference report the report shall be disposed of as provided in section 313(d) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

DURBIN AMENDMENTS NOS. 186–187

Mr. LAUTENBERG (for Mr. DURBIN) proposed two amendments to the concurrent resolution, S. Con. Res. 20, supra; as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 186

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. . SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT THE PROVISIONS OF THIS RESOLUTION ASSUME THAT IT IS THE POLICY OF THE UNITED STATES TO PROVIDE AS SOON AS IS TECHNOLOGICALLY POSSIBLE AN EDUCATION FOR EVERY AMERICAN CHILD THAT WILL ENABLE EACH CHILD TO EFFECTIVELY MEET THE CHALLENGES OF THE 21st CENTURY.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) Pell Grants require an increase of $5 billion per year to fund the maximum award established in the Higher Education Act Amendments of 1998;

(2) IDEA needs at least $13 billion more per year to fund the federal commitment to fund 40% of the excess costs for special education services;

(3) Title I needs at least $4 billion more per year to serve all eligible children;

(4) over $11 billion over the next six years will be required to hire 100,000 teachers to reduce class size to an average of 18 in grades 1–3;

(5) according to the General Accounting Office, it will cost $112 billion just to bring existing school buildings up to good overall condition. According to GAO, one-third of schools serving 14 million children require extensive repair or replacement of one or more of their buildings. GAO also found that almost half of all schools lack even the basic electrical wiring needed to support full-scale use of computers;

(6) the federal share of education spending has declined from 11.9% in 1980 to 7.6% in 1998;

(7) federal spending for education has declined from 2.5% of all federal spending in FY 1980 to 2.0% in FY 1999;

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the Sense of the Senate that the provisions of this resolution assume that it is the policy of the United States to provide as soon as is technologically possible an education for every American child that will enable each child to effectively meet the challenges of the 21st century.

AMENDMENT NO. 187

At the end of Title II, insert the following:

"SEC. . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO FOSTER THE EMPLOYMENT AND INDEPENDENCE OF INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the Senate, revenue and spending aggregates and other appropriate budgetary levels and limits may be adjusted and allocations may be revised for legislation that finances disability programs designed to allow individuals with disabilities to become employed and remain independent, provided that, to the extent that this concurrent resolution on the budget does not include the costs of that legislation, the enactment of that legislation will not increase (by virtue of either contemporaneous or previously-passed deficit reduction) the deficit in this resolution for—

(1) fiscal year 2000;

(2) the period of fiscal years 2000 through 2004; or

(3) the period of fiscal years 2005 through 2009.

(b) REVISED ALLOCATIONS.—

(1) ADJUSTMENTS FOR LEGISLATION.—Upon the consideration of legislation pursuant to subsection (a), the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may file with the Senate appropriately-revised allocations under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and revised functional levels and aggregates to carry out this section. These revised allocations, functional levels, and aggregates shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as allocations, functional levels, and aggregates contained in this resolution.

(2) ADJUSTMENTS FOR AMENDMENTS.—If the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate submits an adjustment under this section for legislation in furtherance of the purpose described in subsection (a), upon the offering of an amendment to that legislation that would necessitate such submission, the Chairman shall submit to the Senate appropriately-revised allocations under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and revised functional levels and aggregates to carry out this section. These revised allocations, functional levels, and aggregates shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as allocations, functional levels, and aggregates contained in this resolution.

(c) REPORTING REVISED ALLOCATIONS.—The appropriate committees shall report appropriately-revised allocations pursuant to section 302(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to carry out this section.''

DORGAN AMENDMENT NO. 188

Mr. LAUTENBERG (for Mr. DORGAN) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution, S. Con. Res. 20, supra; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3___. SENSE OF THE SENATE CONCERNING EXEMPTION OF AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES AND PRODUCTS, MEDICINES, AND MEDICAL PRODUCTS FROM UNILATERAL ECONOMIC SANCTIONS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) prohibiting or otherwise restricting the donation or sale of agricultural commodities or products, medicines, or medical products in order to unilaterally sanction a foreign government for actions or policies that the United States finds objectionable unnecessarily harms innocent populations in the targeted country and rarely causes the sanctioned government to alter its actions or policies;

(2) for the United States as a matter of policy to deny access to agricultural commodities or products, medicines, or medical products by innocent men, women, and children in other countries weakens the international leadership and moral authority of the United States; and

(3) unilateral sanctions on the sale or donation of agricultural commodities or products, medicines, or medical products needlessly harm agricultural producers and workers employed in the agricultural or medical sectors in the United States by foreclosing markets for the commodities, products, or medicines.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution and legislation enacted pursuant to this resolution assume that the President should—

(1) subject to paragraph (2), exempt agricultural commodities and products, medicines, and medical products from any unilateral economic sanction imposed on a foreign government; and

(2) apply the sanction to the commodities, products, or medicines if the application is necessary—

(A) for health or safety reasons; or

(B) due to a domestic shortage of the commodities, products, or medicines.

DORGAN AMENDMENT NO. 189

Mr. LAUTENBERG (for Mr. DORGAN) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution, S. Con. Res. 20, supra; as follows:

At the end of title III, insert the following:

SEC. ___. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING CAPITAL GAINS TAX FAIRNESS FOR FAMILY FARMERS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) one of the most popular provisions included in the Taxpayer Relief Act of 1997 permits many families to exclude from Federal income taxes up to $500,000 of gain from the sale of their principal residences;

(2) under current law, family farmers are not able to take full advantage of this $500,000 capital gains exclusion that families living in urban or suburban areas enjoy on the sale of their homes;

(3) for most urban and suburban residents, their homes are their major financial asset and as a result such families, who have owned their homes through many years of

appreciation, can often benefit from a large portion of this new $500,000 capital gains exclusion;

(4) most family farmers plow any profits they make back into the whole farm rather than into the house which holds little or no value;

(5) unfortunately, farm families receive little benefit from this capital gains exclusion because the Internal Revenue Service separates the value of their homes from the value of the land the homes sit on;

(6) we should recognize in our tax laws the unique character and role of our farm families and their important contributions to our economy, and allow them to benefit more fully from the capital gains tax exclusion that urban and suburban homeowners already enjoy; and

(7) we should expand the $500,000 capital gains tax exclusion to cover sales of the farmhouse and the surrounding farmland over their lifetimes.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution assume that if we pass tax relief measures in accordance with the assumptions in the budget resolution, we should ensure that such legislation removes the disparity between farm families and their urban and suburban counterparts with respect to the new $500,000 capital gains tax exclusion for principal residence sales by expanding it to cover gains from the sale of farmland along with the sale of the farmhouse.

KERRY (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 190

Mr. LAUTENBERG (for Mr. KERRY for himself, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. REED, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. KERREY, and Mr. CONRAD) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution, S. Con. Res. 20, supra; as follows:

At the end of title II, insert the following:

SEC. ___. 1-YEAR DELAY OF PORTION OF CERTAIN TAX PROVISIONS NECESSARY TO AVOID FUTURE BUDGET DEFICITS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate shall provide in any reconciliation legislation provided pursuant to sections 104 and 105—

(1) a provision requiring the Congressional Budget Office to report to Congress on June 30 of each year (beginning in 2000) on the estimated Federal budget revenue impact over the next 1, 5, and 10-fiscal year period of that portion of any tax provision included in such reconciliation legislation which has not gone into effect in the taxable year in which such report is made, and

(2) in any tax provision to be included in such reconciliation legislation a provision delaying for 1 additional taxable year that portion of such provision which did not go into effect before a trigger year.

(b) TRIGGER YEAR.—For purposes of subsection (a)(2), the term ''trigger year'' means the 1st fiscal year in which the projected Federal on-budget surplus for the 1, 5, or 10-fiscal year period, as determined by the report under subsection (a)(1), is exceeded by the amount of the aggregate reduction in revenues for such period resulting from the enactment of all of the tax provisions in the reconciliation legislation described in subsection (a).

TORRICELLI (AND DURBIN) AMENDMENT NO. 191

Mr. LAUTENBERG (for Mr. TORRICELLI, for himself, and Mr. DURBIN) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution, S. Con. Res. 20, supra; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3___. SENSE OF THE SENATE CONCERNING FUNDING FOR THE URBAN PARKS AND RECREATION RECOVERY (UPARR) PROGRAM.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) every analysis of national recreation issues in the last 3 decades has identified the importance of close-to-home recreation opportunities, particularly for residents in densely-populated urban areas;

(2) the Land and Water Conservation Fund grants program under the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 (16 U.S.C. 460*l*–4 et seq.) was established partly to address the pressing needs of urban areas;

(3) the National Urban Recreation Study of 1978 and the President's Commission on Americans Outdoors of 1987 revealed that critical urban recreation resources were not being addressed;

(4) older city park structures and infrastructures worth billions of dollars are at risk because government incentives favored the development of new areas over the revitalization of existing resources, ranging from downtown parks established in the 19th century to neighborhood playgrounds and sports centers built from the 1920's to the 1950's;

(5) the Urban Parks and Recreation Recovery (UPARR) program, established under the Urban Park and Recreation Recovery Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 2501 et seq.), authorized $725,000,000 to provide matching grants and technical assistance to economically distressed urban communities;

(6) the purposes of the UPARR program is to provide direct Federal assistance to urban localities for rehabilitation of critically needed recreation facilities, and to encourage local planning and a commitment to continuing operation and maintenance of recreation programs, sites, and facilities; and

(7) funding for UPARR is supported by a wide range of organizations, including the National Association of Police Athletic Leagues, the Sporting Goods Manufacturers Association, the Conference of Mayors, and Major League Baseball.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution and legislation enacted pursuant to this resolution assume that Congress considers the UPARR program to be a high priority, and should appropriate such amounts as are necessary to carry out the Urban Parks and Recreation Recovery (UPARR) program established under the Urban Park and Recreation Recovery Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 2501 et seq.).

KENNEDY (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 192

Mr. LAUTENBERG (for Mr. KENNEDY for himself, Mr. DODD, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. DASCHLE, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. REED, Mr. FEINGOLD, Mr. LIEBERMAN, and Mr. LEVIN) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution, S. Con. Res. 20, supra; as follows:

On page 3, strike beginning with line 5 through page 5, line 14, and insert the following:

(1) FEDERAL REVENUES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution—

(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: $1,401,979,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,436,108,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,467,563,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: $1,548,594,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $1,604,382,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $1,668,856,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: $1,703,047,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: $1,756,420,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: $1,826,649,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $1,890,274,000,000.

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be changed are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: $0.
Fiscal year 2001: −$6,539,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: −$40,713,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: −$14,724,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: −$29,767,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: −$42,040,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: −$87,666,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: −$114,980,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: −$129,560,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: −$155,436,000,000.

(2) NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: $1,426,931,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,474,165,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,506,259,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: $1,580,072,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $1,633,179,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $1,688,032,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: $1,717,635,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: $1,773,679,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: $1,835,769,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $1,896,955,000,000.

(3) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: $1,408,292,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,436,108,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,467,563,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: $1,548,594,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $1,601,483,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $1,659,025,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: $1,688,217,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: $1,736,657,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: $1,801,829,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $1,862,458,000,000.

On page 23, strike beginning with line 14 through page 25, line 3, and insert the following:

Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $67,373,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $63,994,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $84,420,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $66,249,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $86,077,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $78,442,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $92,893,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $86,110,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $78,948,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $91,867,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $99,653,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $96,488,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $98,462,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $98,798,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $106,245,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $98,893,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $102,174,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $100,241,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $103,037,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $100,818,000,000.

On page 42, strike lines 1 through 5 and insert the following:

(1) to reduce revenues by not more than $0 in fiscal year 2000, $91,744,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2000 through 2004, and $621,426,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2000 through 2009; and

KENNEDY AMENDMENT NO. 193

Mr. LAUTENBERG (for Mr. KENNEDY) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution, S. Con. Res. 20, supra; as follows:

On page 43, strike beginning with line 13 through line page 44, line 10, and insert the following: for fiscal year 2000 or increases in the surplus for any of the outyears, the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall make the adjustments as provided in subsection (c).

(c) ADJUSTMENTS.—The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall take a portion of the amount of increases in the on-budget surplus for fiscal years 2000 through 2004 estimated in the report submitted pursuant to subsection (a) and—

(1) increase the allocation by these amounts to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor and Pensions only for legislation that promotes early educational development and well-being of children for fiscal years 2000 through 2004; and

(2) provide for or increase the on-budget surplus levels used for determining compliance with the pay-as-you-go requirements of section 202 of H. Con. Res. 67 (104th Congress) by those amounts for fiscal year 2000 through 2004.

KENNEDY (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 194

Mr. LAUTENBERG (for Mr. KENNEDY for himself, Mr. DODD, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. HARKIN, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. REED, Mr. FEINGOLD, Mr. LIEBERMAN, and Mr. LEVIN) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution, S. Con. Res. 20, supra; as follows:

On page 3, strike beginning with line 5 through page 5, line 14, and insert the following:

(1) FEDERAL REVENUES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution—

(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: $1,401,979,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,436,108,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,467,563,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: $1,548,594,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $1,604,382,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $1,668,856,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: $1,703,047,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: $1,756,420,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: $1,826,649,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $1,890,274,000,000.

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be changed are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: −$0.
Fiscal year 2001: −$6,539,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: −$40,713,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: −$14,724,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: −$29,767,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: −$42,040,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: −$87,666,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: −$114,980,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: −$129,560,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: −$155,436,000,000.

(2) NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: $1,426,931,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,474,165,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,506,259,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: $1,580,072,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $1,633,179,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $1,688,032,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: $1,717,635,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: $1,773,679,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: $1,835,769,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $1,896,955,000,000.

(3) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: $1,408,292,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,436,108,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,467,563,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: $1,548,594,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $1,601,483,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $1,659,025,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: $1,688,217,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: $1,736,657,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: $1,801,829,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $1,862,458,000,000.

On page 23, strike beginning with line 14 through page 25, line 3, and insert the following:

Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $67,373,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $63,994,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $84,420,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $66,249,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $86,077,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $78,442,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $92,893,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $86,170,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $78,948,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $91,867,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $99,653,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $96,488,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $98,462,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $98,798,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $100,245,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $98,893,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $102,174,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $100,241,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $103,037,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $100,818,000,000.

On page 42, strike lines 1 through 5 and insert the following:

(1) to reduce revenues by not more than $0 in fiscal year 2000, $91,744,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2000 through 2004, and $621,426,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2000 through 2009; and

KENNEDY (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 195

Mr. LAUTENBERG (for Mr. KENNEDY for himself, Mr. WELLSTONE, and Mr. TORRICELLI) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution, S. Con. Res. 20, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. SENSE OF THE SENATE CONCERNING AN INCREASE IN THE MINIMUM WAGE.

It is the sense of the Senate that the minimum hourly wage under section 6 of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 206) should be increased by 50 cents on September 1, 1999, and again on September 1, 2000, to bring the minimum hourly wage to $6.15 an hour, and that such section should apply to the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands.

KENNEDY (AND ROCKEFELLER) AMENDMENT NO. 196

Mr. LAUTENBERG (for Mr. KENNEDY for himself and Mr. ROCKEFELLER) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution, S. Con. Res. 20, supra; as follows:

At the end of title II, insert the following:

SEC. ___. RESERVE FUND FOR MEDICARE PRESCRIPTION DRUG BENEFITS.

(a) ADJUSTMENT.—If legislation is considered that modernizes and strengthens the medicare program under title XVIII of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395 et seq.) and includes a benefit under such title providing affordable prescription drug coverage for all medicare beneficiaries, the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget may change committee allocations, revenue aggregates, and spending aggregates if such legislation will not cause an on-budget deficit for—

(1) fiscal year 2000;

(2) the period of fiscal years 2000 through 2004; or

(3) the period of fiscal years 2005 through 2009.

(b) BUDGETARY ENFORCEMENT.—The revision of allocations and aggregates made under this section shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as allocations and aggregates contained in this resolution.

LIEBERMAN (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 197

Mr. LAUTENBERG (for Mr. LIEBERMAN for himself, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. BINGAMAN, and Mr. ABRAHAM) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution, S. Con. Res. 20, supra; as follows:

At the end of title III, insert the following:

SEC. ___. SENSE OF SENATE REGARDING ASSET-BUILDING FOR THE WORKING POOR.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds the following:

(1) 33 percent of all American households and 60 percent of African American households have no or negative financial assets.

(2) 46.9 percent of all children in America live in households with no financial assets, including 40 percent of Caucasian children and 75 percent of African American children.

(3) In order to provide low-income families with more tools for empowerment, incentives which encourage asset-building should be established.

(4) Across the Nation, numerous small public, private, and public-private asset-building incentives, including individual development accounts, are demonstrating success at empowering low-income workers.

(5) Middle and upper income Americans currently benefit from tax incentives for building assets.

(6) The Federal Government should utilize the Federal tax code to provide low-income Americans with incentives to work and build assets in order to escape poverty permanently.

(b) SENSE OF SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the provisions of this resolution assume that Congress should modify the Federal tax law to include provisions which encourage low-income workers and their families to save for buying a first home, starting a business, obtaining an education, or taking other measures to prepare for the future.

FEINSTEIN (AND BOXER) AMENDMENT NO. 198

Mr. LAUTENBERG (for Mrs. FEINSTEIN for herself and Mrs. BOXER) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution. S. Con. Res. 20, supra; as follows:

At the end of title III, insert the following:

SEC. ___. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON SCAAP FUNDING.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds the following:

(1) The Federal Government has the responsibility for ensuring that our Nation's borders are safe and secure.

(2) States and localities, particularly in high immigrant States, face disproportionate costs in implementing our Nation's immigration policies, particularly in the case of incarcerating criminal illegal aliens.

(3) Federal reimbursements have continually failed to cover the actual costs borne by States and localities in incarcerating criminal illegal aliens. In fiscal year 1999, the costs to States and localities for incarcerating criminal aliens reached over $1,700,000,000, but the Federal Government reimbursed States only $585,000,000.

(4) In fiscal year 1998, the State of California spent approximately $577,000,000 for the incarceration and parole supervision of criminal alien felons, but received just $244,000,000 in reimbursements. The State of Texas spent $133,000,000, but the Federal Government provided only a $53,000,000 reimbursement. The State of Arizona incurred $38,000,000 in costs, but only received $15,000,000 in reimbursements. The State of New Mexico incurred $3,000,000 in cost, but only received $1,000,000 in reimbursements.

(5) The current Administration request of $500,000,000 is significantly below last year's Federal appropriation, despite the fact that more aliens are now being detained in State and local jails.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution assume that the State Criminal Alien Assistance program budget proposal should increase to $970,000,000 and that the budget resolution appropriately reflects sufficient funds to achieve this objective.

BINGAMAN (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 199

Mr. LAUTENBERG (for Mr. Bingaman for himself, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. KENNEDY, Mrs. HUTCHISON, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. CHAFEE, Mr. MOYNIHAN, and Mr. LIEBERMAN) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution, S. Con Res. 20, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following:

SEC. . BUDGETING FOR THE DEFENSE SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM.

"It is the sense of the Senate that the budgetary levels for National Defense (function 050) for fiscal years 2000 through 2008 assume funding for the Defense Science and Technology program that is consistent with Section 214 of the Strom Thurmond National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999, which expresses a sense of the Congress that for each of those fiscal years it should be an objective of the Secretary of Defense to increase the budget request for the Defense Science and Technology program by at least 2 percent over inflation.".

WYDEN AMENDMENT NO. 200

Mr. LAUTENBERG (for Mr. WYDEN) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution, S. Con. Res. 20, supra; as follows:

On page 53, line 4, after "may change committee allocations" insert ", revenue aggregates for legislation that increases taxes on tobacco or tobacco products (only),".

DODD (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 201

Mr. LAUTENBERG (for Mr. DODD, for himself, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. REED) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution, S. Con. Res. 20, surpa; as follows:

On page 3, strike beginning with line 5 through page 5, line 14, and insert the following:

(1) FEDERAL REVENUES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution—

(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: $1,401,979,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,436,033,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,466,653,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: $1,547,102,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $1,602,574,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $1,666,629,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: $1,700,594,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: $1,755,630,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: $1,826,369,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $1,890,274,000,000.

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be changed are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: $0.
Fiscal year 2001: −$6,614,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: −$41,623,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: −$16,216,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: −$31,574,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: −$44,267,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: −$90,119,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: −$115,770,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: −$129,840,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: −$155,436,000,000.

(2) NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: $1,426,931,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,472,665,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,504,559,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: $1,578,337,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $1,630,879,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $1,685,232,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: $1,717,635,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: $1,773,679,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: $1,835,769,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $1,896,955,000,000.

(3) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: $1,408,292,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,436,033,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,466,653,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: $1,547,102,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $1,599,675,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $1,656,798,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: $1,685,764,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: $1,735,867,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: $1,801,549,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $1,862,458,000,000.

On page 23, strike beginning with line 14 through page 25, line 3, and insert the following:

Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $67,373,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $63,994,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $82,920,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $66,174,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $84,377,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $77,532,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $91,158,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $84,618,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $95,249,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $90,059,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $96,853,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $94,261,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $98,462,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $96,345,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $100,245,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $98,103,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $102,174,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $99,961,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $103,037,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $100,818,000,000.

On page 42, strike lines 1 through 5 and insert the following:

(1) to reduce revenues by not more than $0 in fiscal year 2000, $96,028,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2000 through 2004, and $631,461,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2000 through 2009; and

BIDEN AMENDMENT NO. 202

Mr. LAUTENBERG (for Mr. BIDEN) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution, S. Con. Res. 20, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following new section

SEC. . SENSE OF THE SENATE ON IMPORTANCE OF FUNDING FOR EMBASSY SECURITY.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) Enhancing security at U.S. diplomatic missions overseas is essential to protect U.S. government personnel serving on the front lines of our national defense;

(2) 80 percent of U.S. diplomatic missions do not meet current security standards;

(3) the Accountability Review Boards on the Embassy Bombings in Nairobi and Dar Es Salaam recommended that the Department of State spend $1.4 billion annually on embassy security over each of the next ten years;

(4) the amount of spending recommended for embassy security by the Accountability Review Boards is approximately 36 percent of the operating budget requested for the Department of State in Fiscal Year 2000; and

(5) the funding requirements necessary to improve security for United States diplomatic missions and personnel abroad cannot be borne within the current budgetary resources of the Department of State;

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the Sense of the Senate that the budgetary levels in this budget resolution assume that as the Congress contemplates changes in the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to reflect projected on-budget surpluses, provisions similar to those set forth in Section 314(b) of that Act should be considered to ensure adequate funding for enhancements to the security of U.S. diplomatic missions.

HARKIN (AND SPECTER) AMENDMENT NO. 203

Mr. LAUTENBERG (for HARKIN for himself and Mr. SPECTER) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution, S. Con. Res. 20, supra; as follows:

Page 3, line 9: reduce the figure by $1,400,000,000.

Page 3, line 10: reduce the figure by $1,400,000,000.

Page 3, line 11: reduce the figure by $1,400,000,000.

Page 3, line 12: reduce the figure by $1,400,000,000.

Page 3, line 13: reduce the figure by $1,400,000,000.

Page 3, line 14: reduce the figure by $1,400,000,000.

Page 3, line 15: reduce the figure by $1,400,000,000.

Page 3, line 16: reduce the figure by $1,400,000,000.

Page 3, line 17: reduce the figure by $1,400,000,000.

Page 3, line 18: reduce the figure by $1,400,000,000.

Page 4, line 4: change the figure by −$1,400,000,000.

Page 4, line 5: reduce the figure by $1,400,000,000.

Page 4, line 6: reduce the figure by $1,400,000,000.

Page 4, line 7: reduce the figure by $1,400,000,000.

Page 4, line 8: reduce the figure by $1,400,000,000.

Page 4, line 9: reduce the figure by $1,400,000,000.

Page 4, line 10: reduce the figure by $1,400,000,000.

Page 4, line 11: reduce the figure by $1,400,000,000.

Page 4, line 12: reduce the figure by $1,400,000,000.

Page 4, line 13: reduce the figure by $1,400,000,000.

Page 4, line 17: increase the figure by $1,400,000,000.

Page 4, line 18: increase the figure by $1,400,000,000.

Page 4, line 19: increase the figure by $1,400,000,000.

Page 4, line 20: increase the figure by $1,400,000,000.

Page 4, line 21: increase the figure by $1,400,000,000.

Page 4, line 22: increase the figure by $1,400,000,000.

Page 4, line 23: increase the figure by $1,400,000,000.

Page 4, line 24: increase the figure by $1,400,000,000.

Page 4, line 25: increase the figure by $1,400,000,000.

Page 5, line 1: increase the figure by $1,400,000,000.

Page 5, line 5: increase the figure by $1,400,000,000.

Page 5, line 6: increase the figure by $1,400,000,000.

Page 5, line 7: increase the figure by $1,400,000,000.

Page 5, line 8: increase the figure by $1,400,000,000.

Page 5, line 9: increase the figure by $1,400,000,000.

Page 5, line 10: increase the figure by $1,400,000,000.

Page 5, line 11: increase the figure by $1,400,000,000.

Page 5, line 12: increase the figure by $1,400,000,000.

Page 5, line 13: increase the figure by $1,400,000,000.

Page 5, line 14: increase the figure by $1,400,000,000.

Page 25, line 7: increase the figure by $1,400,000,000.

Page 25, line 8: increase the figure by $1,400,000,000.

Page 25, line 11: increase the figure by $1,400,000,000.

Page 25, line 12: increase the figure by $1,400,000,000.

Page 25, line 15: increase the figure by $1,400,000,000.

Page 25, line 16: increase the figure by $1,400,000,000.

Page 25, line 19: increase the figure by $1,400,000,000.

Page 25, line 20: increase the figure by $1,400,000,000.

Page 25, line 23: increase the figure by $1,400,000,000.

Page 25, line 24: increase the figure by $1,400,000,000.

Page 26, line 2: increase the figure by $1,400,000,000.

Page 26, line 3: increase the figure by $1,400,000,000.

Page 26, line 6: increase the figure by $1,400,000,000.

Page 26, line 7: increase the figure by $1,400,000,000.

Page 26, line 10: increase the figure by $1,400,000,000.

Page 26, line 11: increase the figure by $1,400,000,000.

Page 26, line 14: increase the figure by $1,400,000,000.

Page 26, line 15: increase the figure by $1,400,000,000.

Page 26, line 18: increase the figure by $1,400,000,000.

Page 26, line 19: increase the figure by $1,400,000,000.

BIDEN (AND HATCH) AMENDMENT NO. 204

Mr. LAUTENBERG (for Mr. BIDEN, for himself and Mr. HATCH) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution, S. Con. Res. 20, supra; as follows:

At the end of title II, insert the following:

SEC. ___. EXTENSION OF VIOLENT CRIME REDUCTION TRUST FUND.

(a) DISCRETIONARY LIMITS.—In the Senate, in this section, and for the purposes of allocations made for the discretionary category pursuant to section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974,

(1) with respect to fiscal year 2001—

(A) the Chairman of the Budget Committee shall make the necessary adjustments in the discretionary spending limits to reflect the changes in (B); and

(B) for the violent crime reduction category: $6,025,000,000 in new budget authority and $5,718,000,000 in outlays;

(2) with respect to fiscal year 2002—

(A) the Chairman of the Budget Committee shall make the necessary adjustments in the discretionary spending limits to reflect the changes in (B); and

(B) for the violent crime reduction category: $6,169,000,000 in new budget authority and $6,020,000,000 in outlays; and

(3) with respect to fiscal year 2003—

(A) the Chairman of the Budget Committee shall make the necessary adjustments in the discretionary spending limits to reflect the changes in (B); and

(B) for the violent crime reduction category: $6,316,000,000 in new budget authority and $6,161,000,000 in outlays;

(4) with respect to fiscal year 2004—

(A) the Chairman of the Budget Committee shall make the necessary adjustments in the discretionary spending limits to reflect the changes in (B); and

(B) for the violent crime reduction category: $6,458,000 in new budget authority and $6,303,000,000 in outlays; and

(5) with respect to fiscal year 2005—

(A) the Chairman of the Budget Committee shall make the necessary adjustments in the discretionary spending limits to reflect the changes in (B); and

(B) for the violent crime reduction category: $6,616,000 in new budget authority and $6,452,000,000 in outlays;

as adjusted in strict conformance with section 251(b) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 and section 314 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

(b) POINT OF ORDER IN THE SENATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), it shall not be in order in the Senate to consider—

(A) a revision of this resolution or any concurrent resolution on the budget for any of the fiscal years 2000 through 2005 (or amendment, motion, or conference report on such a resolution) that provides discretionary spending in excess of the discretionary spending limit or limits for such fiscal year; or

(B) any bill or resolution (or amendment, motion, or conference report on such bill or resolution) for any of the fiscal years 2000 through 2005 that would cause any of the limits in this section (or suballocations of the discretionary limits made pursuant to section 302(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974) to be exceeded.

(2) EXCEPTION.—This section shall not apply if a declaration of war by Congress is in effect or if a joint resolution pursuant to section 258 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 has been enacted.

(c) WAIVER.—This section may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by the affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

(d) APPEALS.—Appeals in the Senate from the decisions of the Chair relating to any provision of this section shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided between, and controlled by, the appellant and the manager of the concurrent resolution, bill, or joint resolution, as the case may be. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required in the Senate to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this section.

(e) DETERMINATION OF BUDGET LEVELS.—For purposes of this section, the levels of new budget authority, outlays, new entitlement authority, revenues, and deficits for a fiscal year shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the Committee on the Budget of the Senate.

LANDRIEU AMENDMENT NO. 205

Mr. LAUTENBERG (for Ms. LANDRIEU) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution, S. Con. Res. 20, supra; as follows:

On page 46, after line 10, add a new subsection (c) that reads as follows:

(c) LIMITATION.—This reserve fund will only be available for the following types of tax relief:

(1) Tax relief to help working families afford child care, including assistance for families with a parent staying out of the workforce in order to care for young children;

(2) Tax relief to help individuals and their families afford the expense of long-term health care;

(3) Tax relief to ease the tax code's marriage penalties on working families;

(4) Any other individual tax relief targeted exclusively for families in the bottom 90 percent of the family income distribution;

(5) The extension of the Research and Experimentation tax credit, the Work Opportunity tax credit, and other expiring tax provisions, a number of which are important to help American businesses compete in the modern international economy and to help bring the benefits of a strong economy to disadvantaged individuals and communities; and,

(6) Tax incentives to help small businesses offer pension plans to their employees, and other proposals to increase pension access, portability, and security.''

HATCH (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 206

Mr. DOMENICI (for Mr. HATCH for himself, Mr. BIDEN, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. THURMOND) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution, S. Con. Res. 20, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

"SEC. . SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING SUPPORT FOR FEDERAL, STATE AND LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT AND FOR THE VIOLENT CRIME REDUCTION TRUST FUND

''(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that:—

''(1) Our Federal, State and local law enforcement officers provide essential services that preserve and protect our freedom and safety, and with the support of federal assistance such as the Local Law Enforcement Block Grant program, the Juvenile Accountability Incentive Block Grant Program, the COPS Program, and the Byrne Grant program, state and local law enforcement officers have succeeded in reducing the national scourge of violent crime, illustrated by a violent crime rate that has dropped in each of the past four years;

''(2) Assistance, such as the Violent Offender Incarceration/Truth in Sentencing Incentive Grants, provided to State corrections systems to encourage truth in sentencing laws for violent offenders has resulted in longer time served by violent criminals and safer streets for law abiding people across the Nation;

''(3) Through a comprehensive effort by state and local law enforcement to attack violence against women, in concert with the efforts of dedicated volunteers and professionals who provide victim services, shelter, counseling and advocacy to battered women and their children, important strides have been made against the national scourge of violence against women;

''(4) Despite recent gains, the violent crime rate remains high by historical standards;

''(5) Federal efforts to investigate and prosecute international terrorism and complex interstate and international crime are vital aspects of a National anticrime strategy, and should be maintained;

''(6) The recent gains by Federal, State and local law enforcement in the fight against violent crime and violence against women are fragile, and continued financial commitment from the Federal Government for funding and financial assistance is required to sustain a build upon these gains; and

''(7) The Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund, enacted as a part of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994, funds the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994, the Violence Against Women Act of 1994, and the Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996, without adding to the federal budget deficit.

''(B) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the Sense of the Senate that the provisions and the functional totals underlying this resolution assume that the Federal Government's commitment to fund Federal law enforcement programs and programs to assist State and local efforts to combat violent crime, such as the Local Law Enforcement Block Grant Program, the Juvenile Accountability Incentive Block Grant Program, the Violent Offender Incarceration/Truth in Sentencing Incentive Grants program, the Violence Against Women Act, the COPS Program, and the Byrne Grant program, shall be maintained, and that funding for the Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund shall continue to at least fiscal year 2005.''

HATCH AMENDMENT NO. 207

Mr. DOMENICI (for Mr. HATCH) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution, S. Con. Res. 20, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following new section:

''SEC. . SENSE OF THE SENATE ON MERGER ENFORCEMENT BY DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE.

''(a) FINDINGS.—Congress find that—

''(1) The Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice is charged with the civil and criminal enforcement of the antitrust laws, including review of corporate mergers likely to reduce competition in particular markets, with a goal to promote and protect the competitive process;

''(2) the Antitrust Division requests a 16 percent increase in funding for fiscal year 2000;

''(3) justification for such an increase is based, in part, increasingly numerous and complex merger filings pursuant to the Hart-Scott-Rodino Antitrust Improvements Act of 1976;

''(4) the Hart-Scott-Rodino Antitrust Improvements Act of 1976 sets value threshold which trigger the requirement for filing premerger notification;

''(5) the number of merger filings under the Hart-Scott-Rodino Antitrust Improvements Act of 1976, which the Department, in conjunction with the Federal Trade Commission, is required to review, increased by 38 percent in fiscal year 1998;

''(6) the Department expects the number of merger filings to increase in fiscal years 1999 and 2000;

''(7) the value thresholds, which relate to both the size of the companies involved and the size of the transaction, under the Hart-Scott-Rodino Antitrust Improvements Act of 1976 have not been adjusted since passage of that Act.

''(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the Sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution assume that the Antitrust Division will have adequate resources to enable it to meet its statutory requirements, including those related to reviewing and investigating increasingly numerous and complex mergers, but that Congress should make modest, budget neutral, adjustments to the Hart-Scott-Rodino Antitrust Improvements Act of 1976 to account for inflation in the value thresholds of the Act, and in so doing, ensure that the Antitrust Division's resources are focused on matters and transactions most deserving of the Division's attention.

ENZI AMENDMENT NO. 208

Mr. DOMENICI (for Mr. ENZI) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution, S. Con. Res. 20, supra; as follows:

SEC. . SENSE OF THE SENATE ON ELIMINATING THE MARRIAGE PENALTY AND ACROSS THE BOARD INCOME TAX RATE CUTS.

(a) FINDINGS.—THE SENATE FINDS THAT—

(1) The institution of marriage is the cornerstone of the family and civil society;

(2) Strengthening of the marriage commitment and the family is an indispensable step in the renewal of America's culture;

(3) The Federal income tax punishes marriage by imposing a greater tax burden on married couples than on their single counterparts;

(4) America's tax code should give each married couple the choice to be treated as one economic unit, regardless of which spouse earns the income; and

(5) All American taxpayers are responsible for any budget surplus and deserve broad-based tax relief after the Social Security Trust fund has been protected.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution assume that—

(1) Congress should eliminate the marriage penalty in a manner that treats all married couples equally, regardless of which spouse earns the income; and

(2) Congress should implement an equal; across the board reduction in each of the current federal income tax rates as soon as there is a non-Social Security surplus.

SHELBY AMENDMENT NO. 209

Mr. DOMENICI (for Mr. SHELBY) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution, S. Con. Res. 20, supra; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. ___. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING REFORM OF THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1986.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (referred to in this section as the ''tax code'') is unnecessarily complex and burdensome, consisting of 2,000 pages of tax code, and resulting in 12,000 pages of regulations and 200,000 pages of court proceedings;

(2) the complexity of the tax code results in taxpayers spending approximately 5,400,000,000 hours and $200,000,000,000 on tax compliance each year;

(3) the impact of the complexity of the tax code is inherently inequitable, rewarding taxpayers which hire professional tax preparers and penalizing taxpayers which seek to comply with the tax code without professional assistance;

(4) the percentage of the income of an average family of four that is paid for taxes has grown significantly, comprising nearly 40 percent of the family's earnings, a percentage which represents more than a family spends in the aggregate on food, clothing, and housing;

(5) the total amount of Federal, State, and local tax collections in 1998 increased approximately 5.7 percent over such collections in 1997;

(6) the tax code penalizes saving and investment by imposing tax on these important activities twice while promoting consumption by only taxing income used for consumption once;

(7) the tax code stifles economic growth by discouraging work and capital formation through high tax rates;

(8) Congress and the President have found it necessary on several occasions to enact laws to protect taxpayers from abusive actions and procedures of the Internal Revenue Service in enforcement of the tax code; and

(9) the complexity of the tax code is largely responsible for the growth in size of the Internal Revenue Service.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution assume that —

(1) the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 needs comprehensive reform; and

(2) Congress should move expeditiously to consider comprehensive proposals to reform the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

SESSIONS (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 210

Mr. DOMENICI (for Mr. SESSIONS for himself, Mr. ABRAHAM, and Mr. GRAHAM) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution, S. Con. Res. 20, supra; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. ___. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING TAX INCENTIVES FOR EDUCATION SAVINGS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) families in the United States have accrued more college debt in the 1990s than during the previous 3 decades combined; and

(2) families should have every resource available to them to meet the rising cost of higher education.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution and legislation enacted pursuant to this resolution assume that additional tax incentives should be provided for education savings, including—

(1) excluding from gross income distributions from qualified State tuition plans; and

(2) providing a tax deferral for private prepaid tuition plans in years 2000 through 2003 and excluding from gross income distributions from such plans in years 2004 and after.

SANTORUM AMENDMENT NO. 211

Mr. DOMENICI (for Mr. SANTORUM) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution, S. Con. Res. 20, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert:

SEC. . SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING DAVIS-BACON.

It is the Sense of the Senate that in carrying out the assumptions in this budget resolution, the Senate will consider reform of the Davis-Bacon Act as an alternative to repeal.

SANTORUM (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 212

Mr. DOMENICI (for Mr. SANTORUM for himself, Mr. LEAHY, and Mr. TORRICELLI) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution, S. Con. Res. 20, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert:

SEC. . SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT THE 106TH CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION SHOULD REAUTHORIZE FUNDS FOR THE FARMLAND PROTECTION PROGRAM.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate makes the following findings—

(1) Nineteen states and dozens of localities have spent nearly $1 billion to protect over 600,000 acres of important farmland;

(2) The Farmland Protection Program has provided cost-sharing for nineteen states and dozens of localities to protect over 123,000 acres on 432 farms since 1996;

(3) The Farmland Protection Program has generated new interest in saving farmland in communities around the country;

(4) The Farmland Protection Program represents an innovative and voluntary partnership, rewards local ingenuity, and supports local priorities;

(5) The Farmland Protection Program is a matching grant program that is completely voluntary in which the federal government does not acquire the land or easement;

(6) Funds authorized for the Farmland Protection Program were expended at the end of Fiscal Year 1998, and no funds were appropriated in Fiscal Year 1999;

(7) The United States is losing two acres of our best farmland to development every minute of every day;

(8) These lands produce three quarters of the fruits and vegetables and over one half of the dairy in the United States;

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the functional totals contained in this resolution assume that the 106th Congress, 1st Session will reauthorize funds for the Farmland Protection Program.

DEWINE (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 213

Mr. DOMENICI (for Mr. DEWINE for himself, Mr. COVERDELL, Mr. SESSIONS, and Mr. ABRAHAM) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution, S. Con. Res. 20, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING SUPPORT FOR STATE AND LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) the President's budget request for fiscal year 2000 proposes significant reductions in Federal support for State and local law enforcement efforts to combat crime by eliminating more than $1,000,000,000 from State and local law enforcement programs that directly support the Nation's communities, including—

(A) zero funding for Local Law Enforcement Block Grants, for which $523,000,000 was made available for fiscal year 1999;

(B) a reduction from the amount made available for fiscal year 1999 of $645,000,000 for State prison grants (including Violent Offender Incarceration Grants and Truth-in-Sentencing Incentive Grants);

(C) a reduction from the amount made available for fiscal year 1999 of more than $85,000,000 from the State Criminal Alien Incarceration Program, which reimburses States for the incarceration of illegal aliens;

(D) a reduction in funding for the popular Byrne grant program under part E of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968; and

(E) elimination of funding for Juvenile Accountability Block Grants, which have provided $500,000,000 over the last 2 years to communities attempting to control the plague of youth violence;

(2) as national crime rates are beginning to fall as a result of State and local efforts, with Federal support, it is unwise to ignore the responsibility of the Federal Government to communities still overwhelmed by crime;

(3) Federal support is crucial to the provision of critical crime fighting services and the effective administration of justice in the States, such as the approximately 600 qualified State and local crime laboratories and medical examiners' offices, which deliver over 90 percent of the forensic services in the United States;

(4) dramatic increases in crime rates over the last decade have generally exceeded the capacity of State and local crime laboratories to process their forensic examinations, resulting in tremendous backlogs that prevent the swift administration of justice and impede fundamental individual rights, such as the right to a speedy trial and to exculpatory evidence;

(5) last year, Congress passed the Crime Identification Technology Act of 1998, which authorizes $250,000,000 each year for 5 years to assist State and local law enforcement agencies in integrating their anticrime technology systems into national databases, and in upgrading their forensic laboratories and information and communications infrastructures upon which these crime fighting systems rely; and

(6) the Federal Government must continue efforts to significantly reduce crime by at least maintaining Federal funding for State and local law enforcement, and wisely targeting these resources.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the provisions of this resolution assume that—

(1) the amounts made available for fiscal year 2000 to assist State and local law enforcement efforts will be—

(A) greater than the amounts proposed in the President's budget request for fiscal year 2000; and

(B) comparable to amounts made available for that purpose for fiscal year 1999;

(2) the amounts made available for fiscal year 2000 for crime technology programs should be used to further the purposes of the program under section 102 of the Crime Identification Technology Act of 1998 (42 U.S.C. 14601); and

(3) Congress should consider legislation that specifically addresses the backlogs in State and local crime laboratories and medical examiners' offices.

DEWINE (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 214

Mr. DOMENICI (for Mr. DEWINE for himself, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. COVERDELL, Mr. SMITH of Oregon, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. GRAMS, Mr. BURNS, and Mr. HUTCHINSON) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution, S. Con. Res. 20, supra; as follows:

At the end of title III, insert the following:

SEC. ___. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING FUNDING FOR COUNTER-NARCOTICS INITIATIVES.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) from 1985–1992, the Federal Government's drug control budget was balanced among education, treatment, law enforcement, and international supply reduction activities and this resulted in a 13-percent reduction in total drug use from 1988 to 1991;

(2) since 1992, overall drug use among teens aged 12 to 17 rose by 70 percent, cocaine and marijuana use by high school seniors rose 80 percent, and heroin use by high school seniors rose 100 percent;

(3) during this same period, the Federal investment in reducing the flow of drugs outside our borders declined both in real dollars and as a proportion of the Federal drug control budget;

(4) while the Federal Government works with State and local governments and numerous private organizations to reduce the demand for illegal drugs, seize drugs, and break down drug trafficking organizations within our borders, only the Federal Government can seize and destroy drugs outside of our borders;

(5) in an effort to restore Federal international eradication and interdiction efforts, in 1998, Congress passed the Western Hemisphere Drug Elimination Act which authorized an additional $2,600,000,000 over 3 years for international interdiction, eradication, and alternative development activities;

(6) Congress appropriated over $800,000,000 in fiscal year 1999 for anti-drug activities authorized in the Western Hemisphere Drug Elimination Act;

(7) the President's Budget Request for fiscal year 2000 would invest $100,000,000 less than what Congress appropriated in fiscal year 1999;

(8) the President's Budget Request for fiscal year 2000 contains no funding for the Western Hemisphere Drug Elimination Act's top 5 priorities, namely, including funds for an enhanced United States Customs Service air interdiction program, counter-drug intelligence programs, security enhancements for our United States-Mexico border, and a promising eradication program against coca, opium, poppy, and marijuana; and

(9) the proposed Drug Free Century Act would build upon many of the initiatives authorized in the Western Hemisphere Drug Elimination Act, including additional funding for the Department of Defense for counter-drug intelligence and related activities.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the provisions of this resolution assume that—

(1) funding for Federal drug control activities should be at a level higher than that proposed in the President's budget request for fiscal year 2000; and

(2) funding for Federal drug control activities should allow for investments in programs authorized in the Western Hemisphere Drug Elimination Act and in the proposed Drug Free Century Act.

GORTON AMENDMENT NO. 215

Mr. DOMENICI (for Mr. GORTON) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution, S. Con. Res. 20, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. SENSE OF THE SENATE CONCERNING AUTISM.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Infantile autism and autism spectrum disorders are biologically-based neurodevelopmental diseases that cause severe impairments in language and communication and generally manifest in young children sometime during the first two years of life.

(2) Best estimates indicate that 1 in 500 children born today will be diagnosed with an autism spectrum disorder and that 400,000 Americans have autism or an autism spectrum disorder.

(3) There is little information on the prevalence of autism and other pervasive developmental disabilities in the United States. There have never been any national prevalence studies in the United States, and the two studies that were conducted in the 1980s examined only selected areas of the country. Recent studies in Canada, Europe, and Japan suggest that the prevalence of classic autism alone may be 300 percent to 400 percent higher than previously estimated.

(4) Three quarters of those with infantile autism spend their adult lives in institutions or group homes, and usually enter institutions by the age of 13.

(5) The cost of caring for individuals with autism and autism spectrum disorder is great, and is estimated to be $13.3 billion per year solely for direct costs.

(6) The rapid advancements in biomedical science suggest that effective treatments and a cure for autism are attainable if—

(A) there is appropriate coordination of the efforts of the various agencies of the Federal Government involved in biomedical research on autism and autism spectrum disorders;

(B) there is an increased understanding of autism and autism spectrum disorders by the scientific and medical communities involved in autism research and treatment; and

(C) sufficient funds are allocated to research.

(7) The discovery of effective treatments and a cure for autism will be greatly enhanced when scientists and epidemiologists have an accurate understanding of the prevalence and incidence of autism.

(8) Recent research suggests that environmental factors may contribute to autism. As a result, contributing causes of autism, if identified, may be preventable.

(9) Finding the answers to the causes of autism and related developmental disabilities may help researchers to understand other disorders, ranging from learning problems, to hyperactivity, to communications deficits that affect millions of Americans.

(10) Specifically, more knowledge is needed concerning—

(A) the underlying causes of autism and autism spectrum disorders, how to treat the underlying abnormality or abnormalities causing the severe symptoms of autism, and how to prevent these abnormalities from occurring in the future;

(B) the epidemiology of, and the identification of risk factors for, infantile autism and autism spectrum disorders;

(C) the development of methods for early medical diagnosis and functional assessment of individuals with autism and autism spectrum disorders, including identification and assessment of the subtypes within the autism spectrum disorders, for the purpose of monitoring the course of the disease and developing medically sound strategies for improving the outcomes of such individuals;

(D) existing biomedical and diagnostic data that are relevant to autism and autism spectrum disorders for dissemination to medical personnel, particularly pediatricians, to aid in the early diagnosis and treatment of this disease; and

(E) the costs incurred in educating and caring for individuals with autism and autism spectrum disorders.

(11) In 1998, the National Institutes of Health announced a program of research on autism and autism spectrum disorders. A sufficient level of funding should be made available for carrying out the program.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the assumptions underlying this resolution assume that additional resources will be targeted towards autism research through the National Institutes of Health and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

ROBERTS (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 216

Mr. DOMENICI (for Mr. ROBERTS for himself, Mr. SMITH of Oregon, and Mr. SANTORUM) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution, S. Con. Res. 20, supra; as follows:

At the end of title III, insert the following:

SEC. ___. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING ACCESS TO ITEMS AND SERVICES UNDER MEDICARE PROGRAM.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds the following:

(1) Total hospital operating margins with respect to items and services provided to medicare beneficiaries are expected to decline from 4.3 percent in fiscal year 1997 to 0.1 percent in fiscal year 1999.

(2) Total operating margins for small rural hospitals are expected to decline from 4.2 percent in fiscal year 1998 to negative 5.6 percent in fiscal year 2002, a 233 percent decline.

(3) The Congressional Budget Office recently has estimated that the amount of savings to the medicare program in fiscal years 1998 through 2002 by reason of the amendments to that program contained in the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 is $88,500,000 more than the amount of savings to the program by reason of those amendments that the Congressional Budget Office estimated for those fiscal years immediately prior to the enactment of that Act.

(b) SENSE OF SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the provisions contained in this budget resolution assume that the Senate should—

(1) consider whether the amendments to the medicare program contained in the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 have had an adverse impact on access to items and services under that program; and

(2) if it is determined that additional resources are available, additional budget authority and outlays shall be allocated to address the unintended consequences of change in medicare program policy made by the Balanced Budget Act, including inpatient and outpatient hospital services, to ensure fair and equitable access to all items and services under the program.

FITZGERALD AMENDMENT NO. 217

Mr. DOMENICI (for Mr. FITZGERALD) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution, S. Con. Res. 20, supra; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. _____HONEST REPORTING OF THE DEFICIT.

It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution assume the following:

(1) IN GENERAL.—Effective for fiscal year 2001, the President's budget and the budget report of CBO required under section 202(e) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and the concurrent resolution on the budget should include—

(A) the receipts and disbursements totals of the on-budget trust funds, including the projected levels for at least the next 5 fiscal year; and

(B) the deficit or surplus excluding the on budget trust funds, including the projected levels for at least the next 5 fiscal years.

(2) ITEMIZATION.—Effective for fiscal year 2001, the President's budget and the budget report of CBO required under section 202(e) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 should include an itemization of the on-budget trust funds for the budget year, including receipts, outlays, and balances.

HELMS AMENDMENT NO. 218

Mr. DOMENICI (for Mr. HELMS) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution, S. Con. Res. 20, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place in the concurrent resolution, insert the following:

SEC. ___. INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS BUDGET.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate makes the following findings:

(1) The Administration has attacked the Senate budget resolution which stays within the caps set in the Balanced Budget Agreement reached with the President in 1997. The Administration accuses the Senate of taking a ''meat axe'' to American leadership, and placing a ''foreign policy straitjacket'' on the United States. In fact, the fiscal year 2000 budget continues to fund programs and projects that advance United States interests, while eliminating funding for wasteful or duplicative programs and activities.

(2) The Administration claims that the Senate resolution would cut funds for international affairs in fiscal year 2000 by 15.3 percent. The reality is that the reduction is a five percent decrease from spending in fiscal year 1999. Much of the decrease is a result of savings from reductions assumed by the President in his budget: the President assumes savings from ''one time costs'' in the fiscal year 1999 budget, as well as fiscal year 2000 budget reductions for OPIC, P.L. 480 Programs, and historic levels of foreign assistance to Israel and Egypt . When adjusted for arrearages, the Senate Resolution is only a decrease of $.9 billion in budget authority and $.02 billion in outlays from the fiscal year 1999 levels.

(3) The Administration threatens the budget will hinder consular services and abandon our citizens who travel abroad and leave them to fend for themselves. The reality is that most consular services today are supplemented heavily by machine readable visa, expedited passport, and other fees. The State Department is able to retain these fees due to congressional authorization for the retention of these fees rather then returning them to the general fund of the Treasury. Due to this authority, in fiscal year 2000, the State Department expects to have at least $374,000,000 to expend from fee collections. These funds are in addition to the budget authority provided by the Senate budget resolution.

(4) The Administration argues that this budget will pull the plug on U.S. contributions to UNICEF and Child Survival. In fact, the United States provided more than $122,000,000 or 27 percent of all UNICEF funding in 1997, according to the State Department's most recent statistics (of course, this does not include private donations of United States citizens). At the same time, the United States Agency for International Development is requesting a funding increase

of $119,000,000 for development assistance and $15,000,000 for operating expenses even as the General Accounting Office reports that the Agency for International Development cannot explain how its programs are performing or whether they are achieving their intended goals.

(5) The Administration argues that this budget will reduce the United States commitment to the war on drugs. In fiscal year 1999, Congress appropriated funds for drug interdiction programs far exceeding the Administration's request; moreover, the comprehensive Western Hemisphere Drug Elimination Act enacted in October 1998 authorizes nearly $1,000,000,000 in new funds, equipment, and technology to correct the dangerous imbalance in the Administration's anti-drug strategy that has underfunded and continues to underfund interdiction programs. (The President's fiscal year 2000 budget continues to short-change anti-drug activities by the Customs Service and the Coast Guard.)

(6) The Administration argues that this budget will erode support for peace in the Middle East, Bosnia, and Northern Ireland. However, funding for peacekeeping continues to skyrocket. However, the cost of peacekeeping has become a burden on the 050 defense budget rather than the 150 foreign affairs budget since the failure of the United Nations mission in Bosnia. Last year, the United States expended $4,277,500,000 on peacekeeping and related activities in Bosnia, Iraq, other Middle East peacekeeping, and in Africa. This amount does not include funds for humanitarian and development activities.

(7) The Administration argues that this budget will force the United States to close its embassies and turn its back on American interests. The budget will instead force the Executive branch to take on greater cost-based decisionmaking. According to the General Accounting Office, ''more needs to be done to create a well-tuned platform for conducting foreign affairs. Achieving this goal will require the State Department to make a strong commitment to management improvement, modernization, and 'cost-based' decisionmaking.'' The General Accounting Office reports that ''one of State's longstanding shortcomings has been the absence of an effective financial management system that can assist managers in making 'cost-based' decisions.''

(8) Prior to the start of fiscal year 2000, the United States Information Agency and the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency will be integrated into the State Department. In addition the Secretary of State will have more direct oversight over the Agency for International Development, and certain functions of that agency will be merged into the State Department. To date, no savings have been identified as a result of this merger. The General Accounting Office identifies potential areas for reduction of duplication as a result of integration in the areas of legal affairs, congressional liaison, press and public affairs, and management. In addition the General Accounting Office notes that in the State Department strategic plan, it has not adequately reviewed overlapping issues performed by State Department functional bureaus and other United States agencies.

(b) SENSE OF SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the budget levels of this resolution assume that enactment of the Foreign Affairs Reform and Restructuring Act of 1998 provides a unique opportunity for the State Department to achieve management improvements and cost reductions, and that:

(1) The Senate believes that savings can be achieved by simply eliminating wasteful and duplicative programs, not the programs cited by the Administration, which generally receive broad bipartisan support. Just a few abuses that could be eliminated to achieve reductions include the following:

(A) $25,000,000 for UNFPA while UNFPA works hand-in-glove with the brutal Communist Chinese dictators to abuse women and children under the coercive one-child-per-family population control policy.

(B) $35,000,000 for the Inter-American Foundation, which funded groups in Ecuador clearly identified by the State Department as terrorist organizations that kidnaped Americans and threatened their lives, as well as the lives and safety of other United States citizens, while extorting money from them.

(C) $105,000,000 proposed for Haiti, which has abandoned democracy in favor of dictatorship and where United States taxpayer funds have been used, according to the International Planned Parenthood Federation's annual report, for ''a campaign to reach voodoo followers with sexual and reproductive health information..by performing short song-prayers about STDs [sexually transmitted diseases] and the benefits of family planning during voodoo ceremonies''.

(D) $60,000,000 over ten years to the American Center for International Labor Solidarity (ACILS), which is AFL-CIOs international nongovernment division. 100% of ACILS's funding is from taxpayers while AFL-CIO contributed $40,956,828 exclusively to Democratic candidates in the 1998 Federal election cycle.

(E) In fiscal year 1999, $200,000 in foreign aid to Canada to underwrite seminars on gender sensitivity for peacekeepers.

(F) In fiscal year 1999, the United States provided the International Labor Organization with $54,774,408. Work produced by that organization included a report advocating recognition of the sex trade as a flourishing economic enterprise and called for recognition of the trade in official statistics.

(G) According to the General Accounting Office, ''USAID has spent, by its own account, $92,000,000 to develop and maintain the NMS [new management system], the system does not work as intended and has created problems in mission operations and morale.''

(H) In fiscal year 1999, the State Department is attempting to send $28,000,000 to fund the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty Organization, which is an organization established by a treaty the United States has not ratified.

(I) Despite sensitive deadlines in the Middle East Peace Process looming, the United Nations is calling for a conference under the auspices of the Fourth Geneva Convention. No conference has been held under that Convention since its inception in 1947. The topic for discussion is Israeli Settlements in the West Bank and Gaza. The United States opposes this conference yet contributes 25 percent of the United Nations budget.

(J) The United States has spent more than $3,000,000,000 to ''restore democracy in Haiti.'' The reality is that there has been no Prime Minister or Cabinet in Haiti for 19 months; the Parliament has been effectively dissolved; local officials serve at the whim of President Preval; the privatization process is stalled; political murders remain unsolved; drug trafficking is rampant. In short, billions of dollars in foreign aid have bought us no leverage with the Haitians.

(K) As a result of consolidation of United States foreign affairs agencies, 1,943 personnel will be transferred into the State Department prior to the start of fiscal year 2000. The fiscal year 2000 budget does not identify a reduction in a single staff position.

(2) Additional funds that may become available from elimination of some foreign assistance programs, management efficiencies as a result of reorganization of the foreign affairs agencies, and new estimates on the size of the budget surplus should be designated for United States embassy upgrades.

SPECTER (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 219

Mr. DOMENICI (for Mr. SPECTER for himself, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. HATCH, Mr. SESSIONS, and Mr. ASHCROFT) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution, S. Con. Res. 20, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place insert the following:

SEC. . SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING FUNDING FOR INTENSIVE FIREARMS PROSECUTION PROGRAMS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) gun violence in America, while declining somewhat in recent years, is still unacceptably high;

(2) keeping firearms out of the hands of criminals can dramatically reduce gun violence in America;

(3) States and localities often do not have the investigative or prosecutorial resources to locate and convict individuals who violate their firearms laws. Even when they do win convictions, states and localities often lack the jail space to hold such convicts for their full prison terms;

(4) there are a number of federal laws on the books which are designed to keep firearms out of the hands of criminals. These laws impose mandatory minimum sentences upon individuals who use firearms to commit crimes of violence and convicted felons caught in possession of a firearm;

(5) the federal government does have the resources to investigate and prosecute violations of these federal firearms laws. The federal government also has enough jail space to hold individuals for the length of their mandatory minimum sentences;

(6) an effort to aggressively and consistently apply these federal firearms laws in Richmond, Virginia, has cut violent crime in that city. This program, called Project Exile, has produced 288 indictments during its first two years of operation and has been credited with contributing to a 15% decrease in violent crimes in Richmond during the same period. In the first three-quarters of 1998, homicides with a firearm in Richmond were down 55% compared to 1997;

(7) the Fiscal Year 1999 Commerce-State-Justice Appropriations Act provided $1.5 million to hire additional federal prosecutors and investigators to enforce federal firearms laws in Philadelphia. The Philadelphia project—called Operation Cease Fire—started on January 1, 1999. Since it began, the project has resulted in 31 indictments of 52 defendants on firearms violations. The project has benefited from help from the Philadelphia Police Department and the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms which was not paid for out of the $1.5 million grant;

(8) Senator Hatch has introduced legislation to authorize Project CUFF, a federal firearms prosecution program;

(9) the Administration has requested $5 million to conduct intensive firearms prosecution projects on a national level;

(10) given that at least $1.5 million is needed to run an effective program in one American city—Philadelphia—$5 million is far from enough funding to conduct such programs nationally.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that Function 750 in the budget resolution assumes that $50,000,000 will be provided in fiscal year 2000 to conduct intensive firearms prosecution projects to combat violence in the twenty-five American cities with the highest crime rates.

SPECTER (AND GRAHAM) AMENDMENT NO. 220

Mr. DOMENICI (for Mr. SPECTER for himself and Mr. GRAHAM) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution, S. Con. Res. 20, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert:

SEC. . SENSE OF THE SENATE ON WOMEN'S ACCESS TO OBSTETRIC AND GYNECOLOGICAL SERVICES.

(A) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

In the 105th Congress, the House of Representatives acted favorably on The Patient Protection Act (H.R. 4250), which included provisions which required health plans to allow women direct access to a participating physician who specializes in obstetrics and gynecological services.

Women's health historically has received little attention.

Access to an obstetrician-gynecologist improves the health care of a woman by providing routine and preventive health care throughout the women's lifetime, encompassing care of the whole patient, while also focusing on the female reproductive system.

60 percent of all office visits to obstetrician-gynecologists are for preventive care.

Obstetrician-gynecologists are uniquely qualified on the basis of education and experience to provide basic women's health care services.

While more than 36 States have acted to promote residents' access to obstetrician-gynecologists, patients in other States or in Federally-governed health plans are not protected from access restrictions or limitations.

(B) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the provisions in this concurrent resolution on the budget assume that the Congress shall enact legislation that requires health plans to provide women with direct access to a participating provider who specializes in obstetrics and gynecological services.

JEFFORDS (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 221

Mr. DOMENICI (for Mr. JEFFORDS for himself, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. ROTH, Mr. MOYNIHAN, and Mr. GRAMS) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution, S. Con. Res. 20, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____. SENSE OF THE SENATE CONCERNING FOSTERING THE EMPLOYMENT AND INDEPENDENCE OF INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate makes the following findings:

(1) Health care is important to all Americans.

(2) Health care is particularly important to individuals with disabilities and special health care needs who often cannot afford the insurance available to them through the private market, are uninsurable by the plans available in the private sector, or are at great risk of incurring very high and economically devastating health care costs.

(3) Americans with significant disabilities often are unable to obtain health care insurance that provides coverage of the services and supports that enable them to live independently and enter or rejoin the workforce. Coverage for personal assistance services, prescription drugs, durable medical equipment, and basic health care are powerful and proven tools for individuals with significant disabilities to obtain and retain employment.

(4) For individuals with disabilities, the fear of losing health care and related services is one of the greatest barriers keeping the individuals from maximizing their employment, earning potential, and independence.

(5) Individuals with disabilities who are beneficiaries under title II or XVI of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 401 et seq., 1381 et seq.) risk losing medicare or medicaid coverage that is linked to their cash benefits, a risk that is an equal, or greater, work disincentive than the loss of cash benefits associated with working.

(6) Currently, less than ½ of 1 percent of social security disability insurance (SSDI) and supplemental security income (SSI) beneficiaries cease to receive benefits as a result of employment.

(7) Beneficiaries have cited the lack of adequate employment training and placement services as an additional barrier to employment.

(8) If an additional ½ of 1 percent of the current social security disability insurance (SSDI) and supplemental security income (SSI) recipients were to cease receiving benefits as a result of employment, the savings to the Social Security Trust Funds in cash assistance would total $3,500,000,000 over the worklife of the individuals.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the provisions of this resolution assume that the Work Incentives Improvement Act of 1999 (S. 331, 106th Congress) will be passed by the Senate and enacted early this year, and thereby provide individuals with disabilities with the health care and employment preparation and placement services that will enable those individuals to reduce their dependency on cash benefit programs.

JEFFORDS (AND OTHER) AMENDMENT NO. 222

Mr. DOMENICI (for Mr. JEFFORDS for himself, Mr. MOYNIHAN, Mr. CHAFEE, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. DODD, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KERRY, Mr. KOHL, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. REID, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. WELLSTONE, and Mr. BINGAMAN) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution, S. Con. Res. 20, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following new section:

SEC. . SENSE OF THE SENATE ON LIHEAP.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that:

(1) Home energy assistance for working and low-income families with children, the elderly on fixed incomes, the disabled, and others who need such aid is a critical part of the social safety net in cold-weather areas during the winter, and a source of necessary cooling aid during the summer.

(2) LIHEAP is a highly targeted, cost-effective way to help millions of low-income Americans pay their home energy bills. More than two-thirds of LIHEAP-eligible households have annual incomes of less than $8,000, approximately one-half have annual incomes below $6,000; and

(3) LIHEAP funding has been substantially reduced in recent years, and cannot sustain further spending cuts if the program is to remain a viable means of meeting the home heating and other energy-related needs of low-income families, especially those in cold-weather states.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—The assumptions underlying this budget resolution assume that it is the sense of the Senate that the funds made available for LIHEAP for Fiscal Year 2000 will not be less than the current services for LIHEAP in Fiscal Year 1999.

HUTCHISON (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 223

Mr. DOMENICI (for Mrs. HUTCHISON for herself, Mr. KYL, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. SNOWE, and Mr. GRAMM) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution, S. Con. Res. 20, supra; as follows:

At the end of title III, insert the following:

SEC. . SENSE OF THE SENATE ON SOUTHWEST BORDER LAW ENFORCEMENT FUNDING.

(A) FINDINGS.—

(1) The Federal Government has not effectively secured the Southwest Border of the United States. According to the Drug Enforcement Administration, 50 to 70 percent of illegal drugs enter the United States through Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, and California. According to the State Department's 1999 International Narcotics Strategy Report, 60 percent of the Columbian cocaine sold in the United States passes through Mexico before entering the United States.

(2) General Barry McCaffrey, Director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy, has stated that 20,000 Border Patrol agents are needed to secure the United States' southern and northern borders. Currently, the Border Patrol has approximately 8,000 agents.

(3) The Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996, requires the Attorney General to increase by not less than 1,000 the number of positions for full-time, active duty Border Patrol agents in fiscal years 1997, 1998, 1999, 2000, and 2001. The Administration's fiscal year 2000 budget provides no funding to hire additional full-time Border Patrol agents.

(4) The U.S. Customs Service plays an integral role in the detection, deterrence, disruption and seizure of illegal drugs as well as the facilitation of trade across the Southwest Border of the United States. Customs requested 506 additional inspectors in its fiscal year 2000 budget submission to the Office of Management and Budget. In their fiscal year 2000 budget request to Congress, however, the Administration provides no funding to hire additional, full-time Customs Service inspectors.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the budgetary levels in this budget resolution assume full funding for the Immigration and Naturalization Service to hire 1,000 full-time, active-duty Border Patrol agents in fiscal year 2000, as authorized by the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996. Further, it is the sense of the Senate that the budgetary levels in this budget resolution assume funding for the Customs Service to hire necessary staff and purchase equipment for drug interdiction and traffic facilitation at United States land border crossings, including 506 full-time, active-duty Customs inspectors.

ASHCROFT (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 224

Mr. DOMENICI (for Mr. ASHCROFT, Mr. BAUCUS, and Mr. BOND) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution, S. Con. Res. 20, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. . SENSE OF THE CONGRESS REGARDING SOUTH KOREA'S INTERNATIONAL TRADE PRACTICES ON PORK AND BEEF.

FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that:

Asia is the largest regional export market for America's farmers and ranchers, traditionally purchasing approximately 40 percent of all U.S. agricultural exports;

The Department of Agriculture forecasts that over the next year American agricultural exports to Asian countries will decline by several billion dollars due to the Asian financial crisis;

The United States is the producer of the safest agricultural products from farm to table, customizing goods to meet the needs of customers worldwide, and has established the image and reputation as the world's best provider of agricultural products;

American farmers and ranchers, and more specifically, American pork and beef producers, are dependent on secure, open, and competitive Asian export markets for their products;

United States pork and beef producers not only have faced the adverse effects of depreciated and unstable currencies and lowered demand due to the Asian financial crisis, but also have been confronted with South Korea's pork subsidies and its failures to keep commitments on market access for beef;

It is the policy of the United States to prohibit South Korea from using United States and International Monetary Fund assistance to subsidize targeted industries and compete unfairly for market share against U.S. products;

The South Korean Government has been subsidizing its pork exports to Japan, resulting in a 973 percent increase in its exports to Japan since 1992, and a 71 percent increase in the last year;

Pork already comprises 70 percent of South Korea's agriculture exports to Japan, yet the South Korean Government has announced plans to invest 100,000,000,000 won in its agricultural sector in order to flood the Japanese market with even more South Korean pork;

The South Korean Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries reportedly has earmarked 25,000,000,000 won for loans to Korea's pork processors in order for them to purchase more Korean pork and to increase exports to Japan;

Any export subsidies on pork, including those on exports from South Korea to Japan, would violate South Korea's international trade agreements and may be actionable under the World Trade Organization;

South Korea's subsidiaries are hindering U.S. pork and beef producers from capturing their full potential in the Japanese market, which is the largest export market for U.S. pork and beef, importing nearly $700,000,000 of U.S. pork and over $1,500,000,000 of U.S. beef last year alone;

Under the United States-Korea 1993 Record of Understanding on Market Access for Beef, which was negotiated pursuant to a 1989 GATT Panel decision against Korea, South Korea was allowed to delay full liberalization of its beef market (in an exception to WTO rules) if it would agree to import increasing minimum quantities of beef each year until the year 2001;

South Korea fell woefully short of its beef market access commitment for 1998; and,

United States pork and beef producers are not able to compete fairly with Korean livestock producers, who have a high cost of production, because South Korea has violated trade agreements and implemented protectionist policies: Now, therefore, be it

It is the sense of the Congress that Congress:

(1) Believes strongly that while a stable global marketplace is in the best interest of America's farmers and ranchers, the United States should seek a mutually beneficial relationship without hindering the competitiveness of American agriculture;

(2) Calls on South Korea to abide by its trade commitments;

(3) Calls on the Secretary of the Treasury to instruct the United States Executive Director of the International Monetary Fund to promote vigorously policies that encourage the opening of markets for beef and pork products by requiring South Korea to abide by its existing international trade commitments and to reduce trade barriers, tariffs, and export subsidies;

(4) Calls on the President and the Secretaries of Treasury and Agriculture to monitor and report to Congress that resources will not be used to stabilize the South Korean market at the expense of U.S. agricultural goods or services; and

(5) Requests the United States Trade Representative and the U.S. Department of Agriculture to pursue the settlement of disputes with the Government of South Korea on its failure to abide by its international trade commitments on beef market access, to consider whether Korea's reported plans for subsidizing its pork industry would violate any of its international trade commitments, and to determine what impact Korea's subsidy plans would have on U.S. agricultural interests, especially in Japan.

SHELBY (AND DOMENICI) AMENDMENT NO. 225

Mr. DOMENICI (for Mr. SHELBY for himself and Mr. DOMENICI) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution, S. Con. Res. 20, supra; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. ___. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON TRANSPORTATION FIREWALLS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) domestic firewalls greatly limit funding flexibility as Congress manages budget priorities in a fiscally constrained budget;

(2) domestic firewalls inhibit congressional oversight of programs and organizations under such artificial protections;

(3) domestic firewalls mask mandatory spending under the guise of discretionary spending, thereby presenting a distorted picture of overall discretionary spending;

(4) domestic firewalls impede the ability of Congress to react to changing circumstances or to fund other equally important programs;

(5) the Congress implemented "domestic discretionary budget firewalls" for approximately 70 percent of function 400 spending in the 105th Congress;

(6) if the aviation firewall proposal circulating in the House of Representatives were to be enacted, over 100 percent of function 400 spending would be firewalled; and

(7) if the aviation firewall proposal circulating in the House of Representatives were to be enacted, drug interdiction activities by the Coast Guard, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration activities, rail safety inspections, Federal support for Amtrak, all National Transportation Safety Board activities, Pipeline and Hazardous materials safety programs, and Coast Guard search and rescue activities would be drastically cut or eliminated from function 400.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution assume that no additional firewalls should be enacted for function 400 transportation activities.

ENZI AMENDMENT NO. 226

Mr. DOMENICI (for Mr. ENZI) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution, S. Con. Res. 20, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert:

SEC. 316. . Sense of the Senate on funding existing, effective public health programs before creating new programs.

(a) FINDINGS.—the Senate finds that—

(1) the establishment of new categorical funding programs has led to proposed cuts in the Preventive Health and Health Services Block Grant to states for broad, public health missions;

(2) Preventive Health and Health Services Block Grant dollars fill gaps in the otherwise-categorical funding states and localities receive, funding such major public health threats as cardiovascular disease, injuries, emergency medical services and poor diet, for which there is often no other source of funding;

(3) in 1981, Congress consolidated a number of programs, including certain public health programs, into block grants for the purpose of best advancing the health, economics and well-being of communities across the country;

(4) The Preventive Health and Health Services Block Grant can be used for programs for screening, outreach, health education and laboratory services;

(5) The Preventive Health and Health Services Block Grant gives states the flexibility to determine how funding available for this purpose can be used to meet each state's preventive health priorities;

(6) The establishment of new public health programs that compete for funding with the Preventive Health and Health Services Block Grant could result in the elimination of effective, localized public health program in every state.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution and legislation enacted pursuant to this resolution assume that there shall be a continuation of the level of funding support for existing public health programs, specifically the Prevention Block Grant, prior to the funding of new public health programs.

ABRAHAM (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 227

Mr. DOMENICI (for Mr. ABRAHAM for himself and Mr. CRAPO, Mr. HAGEL, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. INHOFE, and Ms. COLLINS) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution, S. Con. Res. 20, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. . FINDINGS; SENSE OF CONGRESS ON THE PRESIDENT'S FY 2000 BUDGET PROPOSAL TO TAX ASSOCIATION INVESTMENT INCOME.

(a) The Congress finds that—

(1) The President's fiscal year 2000 federal budget proposal to impose a tax on the interest, dividends, capital gains, rents, and royalties in excess of $10,000 of trade associations and professional societies exempt under sec. 501(c)(6) of the IRC of 1986 represents an unjust and unnecessary penalty on legitimate association activities.

(2) At a time when the government is projecting on-budget surpluses of more than $800,000,000,000 over the next ten years, the President proposes to increase the tax burden on trade and professional association by $1,440,000,000 over the next five years.

(3) The Presidents association tax increase proposal will impose a tremendous burden on thousands of small and mid-sized trade associations and professional societies.

(4) Under the President's association tax increase proposal, most associations with annual operating budgets of as low as $200,000 or more will be taxed on investment income and as many as 70,000 associations nationwide could be affected by this proposal.

(5) Associations rely on this targeted investment income to carry out tax-exempt status related activities, such as training individuals to adapt to the changing workplace, improving industry safety, providing

statistical data, and providing community services.

(6) Keeping investment income free from tax encourages associations to maintain modest surplus funds that cushion against economic and fiscal downturns.

(7) Corporations can increase prices to cover increased costs, while small and medium sized local, regional, and State-based associations do not have such an option, and thus increased costs imposed by the President's association tax increase would reduce resources available for the important standard setting, educational training, and professionalism training performed by association.

(b) It is the sense of Congress that the functional totals in this concurrent resolution on the budget assume that Congress shall reject the President's proposed tax increase on investment income of associations as defined under section 501(c)(6) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

ABRAHAM (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 228

Mr. DOMENICI (for Mr. ABRAHAM for himself, Mr. COVERDELL, and Mr. ASHCROFT) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution, S. Con. Res. 20, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. . FINDINGS; SENSE OF CONGRESS ON THE USE OF FEDERAL FUNDS FOR NEEDLE EXCHANGE PROGRAMS.

(a) The Congress finds that—

(1) Deaths from drug overdoses have increased over five times since 1988.

(2) A Montreal study published in the American Journal of Epidemiology, found that IV addicts who used a needle exchange program were over twice as likely to become infected with HIV as those who did not.

(3) A Vancouver study published in the Journal of AIDS, showed a stunning increase in HIV in drug addicts, from 1 to 2 percent to 23 percent, since that city's needle exchange program was begun in 1988. Deaths from drug overdoses have increased over five times since 1988 and Vancouver now has the highest death rate from heroin in North America.

(4) In November of 1995 the Manhattan Lower East Side Community Board #3 passed a resolution to terminate their needle exchange program due to the fact that ''the community has been inundated with drug dealers, . . . Law-abiding businesses are being abandoned; and much needed law enforcement is being withheld by the police.''

(5) The New York Times Magazine in 1997 reported that one New York City needle exchange program gave out 60 syringes to a single person, little pans to ''cook'' the heroin, instructions on how to inject the drug and a card exempting the user from arrest for possession of drug paraphernalia.

(6) Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Weekly reports that heroin use by American teenagers had doubled in the last five years.

(b) It is the sense of Congress that the functional totals in this concurrent resolution on the budget assume that Congress shall continue the statutory ban on the use of federal funds to implement or support any needle exchange program for drug addicts.

COLLINS (AND GREGG) AMENDMENT NO. 229

Mr. DOMENICI (for Ms. COLLINS for herself and Mr. GREGG) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution, S. Con. Res. 20, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____. SENSE OF THE SENATE CONCERNING FUNDING FOR SPECIAL EDUCATION.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) In the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq.) (referred to in this resolution as the ''Act''), Congress found that improving educational results for children with disabilities is an essential element of our national policy of ensuring equality of opportunity, full participation, independent living, and economic self-sufficiency for individuals with disabilities.

(2) In the Act, the Secretary of Education is instructed to make grants to States to assist them in providing special education and related services to children with disabilities.

(3) The Act represents a commitment by the Federal Government to fund 40 percent of the average per-pupil expenditure in public elementary and secondary schools in the United States.

(4) The budget submitted by the President for fiscal year 2000 ignores the commitment by the Federal Government under the Act to fund special education and instead proposes the creation of new programs that limit the manner in which States may spend the limited Federal education dollars received.

(5) The budget submitted by the President for fiscal year 2000 fails to increase funding for special education, and leaves States and localities with an enormous unfunded mandate to pay for growing special education costs.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the budgetary levels in this resolution assume that part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Act (20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq.) should be fully funded at the originally promised level before any funds are appropriated for new education programs.

STEVENS AMENDMENT NO. 230

Mr. DOMENICI (for Mr. STEVENS) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution, S. Con. Res. 20, supra; as follows:

At the end of section 205 of the resolution, add the following:

''(f) EXCEPTION FOR DEFENSE SPENDING.—This section shall not apply to a provision making discretionary appropriations in the defense category.''.

GRAMS (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 231

Mr. DOMENICI (for Mr. GRAMS for himself, Mr. ROTH, Mr. COVERDELL, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. HAGEL, Mr. BURNS, Mr. MCCAIN, and Mr. CRAIG) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution, S. Con. Res. 20, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert:

SEC. ____. SENSE OF SENATE ON PROVIDING TAX RELIEF TO ALL AMERICANS BY RETURNING NON-SOCIAL SECURITY SURPLUS TO TAXPAYERS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds the following:

(1) Every cent of Social Security surplus should be reserved to pay Social Security benefits, for Social Security reform, or to pay down the debt held by the public and not be used for other purposes.

(2) Medicare should be fully funded.

(3) Even after safeguarding Social Security and Medicare, a recent Congressional Research Service study found that an average American family will pay $5,307 more in taxes over the next 10 years than the government needs to operate.

(4) The Administration's budget returns none of the excess surplus back to the taxpayers and instead increases net taxes and fees by $96,000,000,000 over 10 years.

(5) The burden of the Administration's tax increases falls disproportionately on low- and middle-income taxpayers. A recent Tax Foundation study found that individuals with incomes of less than $25,000 would bear 38.5 percent of the increased tax burden, while taxpayers with incomes between $25,000 and $50,000 would pay 22.4 percent of the new taxes.

(6) The budget resolution returns most of the non-Social Security surplus to those who worked so hard to produce it by providing $142,000,000,000 in real tax relief over 5 years and almost $800,000,000,000 in tax relief over 10 years.

(7) The budget resolution builds on the following tax relief that Republicans have provided since 1995:

(A) In 1995, Republicans proposed the Balanced Budget Act of 1995 which included tax relief for families, savings and investment incentives, health care-related tax relief, and relief for small business—tax relief that was vetoed by President Clinton.

(B) In 1996, Republicans provided, and the President signed, tax relief for small business and health care-related tax relief.

(C) In 1997, Republicans once again pushed for tax relief in the context of a balanced budget, and this time President Clinton signed into law a $500 per child tax credit, expanded individual retirement accounts and the new Roth IRA, a cut in the capital gains tax rate, education tax relief, and estate tax relief.

(D) In 1998, Republicans (initially opposed by the Administration) pushed for reform of the Internal Revenue Service, and provided tax relief for America's farmers.

(8) Americans deserve further tax relief because they are still overpaying. They deserve a refund. Federal taxes currently consume nearly 21 percent of national income, the highest percentage since World War II. Families are paying more in Federal, State, and local taxes than for food, clothing, and shelter combined.

(b) SENSE OF SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the levels in this resolution assume that the Senate not only puts a priority on protecting Social Security and Medicare and reducing the Federal debt, but also on middle-class tax relief by returning some of the non-Social Security surplus to those from whom it was taken; and

(2) such middle-class tax relief could include broad-based tax relief, marriage penalty relief, retirement savings incentives, death tax relief, savings and investment incentives, health care-related tax relief, education-related tax relief, and tax simplification proposals.

SNOWE (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 232

Mr. DOMENICI (for Ms. SNOWE for herself, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. SMITH of Oregon) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution, S. Con. Res. 20, supra; as follows:

On page 53, line 4, after ''may change committee allocations'' insert '', revenue aggregates for legislation that increases taxes on tobacco or tobacco products (only),''.

COVERDELL (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 233

Mr. DOMENICI (for Mr. COVERDELL for himself, Mr. INHOFE, and Mr. ENZI) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution, S. Con. Res. 20, supra; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. ___. RESTRICTION ON RETROACTIVE INCOME AND ESTATE TAX RATE INCREASES.

(a) PURPOSE.—The Senate declares that it is essential to ensure taxpayers are protected against retroactive income and estate tax rate increases.

(b) POINT OF ORDER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report, that includes a retroactive Federal income tax rate increase.

(2) DEFINITION.—In this section—

(A) the term ''Federal income tax rate increase'' means any amendment to subsection (a), (b), (c), (d), or (e) of section 1, or to section 11(b) or 55(b), of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, that imposes a new percentage as a rate of tax and thereby increases the amount of tax imposed by any such section; and

(B) a Federal income tax rate increase is retroactive if it applies to a period beginning prior to the enactment of the provision.

(c) SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER.—

(1) WAIVER.—The point of order in subsection (b) may be waived or suspended only by the affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

(2) APPEALS.—An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (b).

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section takes effect on January 1, 1999.

COVERDELL (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 234

Mr. DOMENICI (for Mr. COVERDELL for himself, Mr. TORRICELLI, and Mr. ABRAHAM) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution, S. Con. Res. 20, supra; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. ____. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING INCENTIVES FOR SMALL SAVERS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) in general, the Federal budget will accumulate nearly $800,000,000,000 in non-Social Security surpluses through 2009;

(2) such a level of surplus affords Congress the opportunity to return a portion to the taxpayers in the form of tax relief;

(3) the Federal tax burden is at its highest level in over 50 years;

(4) personal bankruptcy filings reached a record high in 1998 with $40,000,000,000 in debts discharged;

(5) the personal savings rate is at record lows not seen since the Great Depression;

(6) the personal savings rate was 9 percent of income in 1982;

(7) the personal savings rate was 5.7 percent of income in 1992;

(8) the personal savings rate plummeted to 0.5 percent in 1998;

(9) the personal savings rate could plummet to as low as negative 4.5 percent if current trends do not change;

(10) personal saving is important as a means for the American people to prepare for crisis, such as a job loss, health emergency, or some other personal tragedy, or to prepare for retirement;

(11) President Clinton recently acknowledged the low rate of personal savings as a concern;

(12) raising the starting point for the 28 percent personal income tax bracket by $10,000 over 5 years would move 7,000,000 middle-income taxpayers into the lowest income tax bracket;

(13) excluding the first $500 from interest and dividends income, or $250 for singles, would enable 30,000,000 low- and middle-income taxpayers to save tax-free and would translate into approximately $1,000,000,000,000 in savings;

(14) exempting the first $5,000 in capital gains income from capital gains taxation would mean 10,000,000 low- and middle-income taxpayers would no longer pay capital gains tax;

(15) raising the deductible limit for Individual Retirement Account contributions from $2,000 to $3,000, would mean over 5,000,000 taxpayers will be better equipped for retirement; and

(16) tax relief measures to encourage savings and investments for low- and middle-income savers would mean tax relief for nearly 112,000,000 individual taxpayers by—

(A) raising the starting point for the 28 percent personal income tax bracket by $10,000 over 5 years;

(B) excluding from income the first $500 in interest and dividend income ($250 for singles);

(C) exempting from capital gains taxation the first $5,000 in capital gains taxes; and

(D) raising the deductible limit for Individual Retirement Account contributions from $2,000 to $3,000.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this budget resolution and legislation enacted pursuant to this resolution assume that—

(1) Congress will adopt tax relief that provides incentives for savings and investment for low- and middle-income working families that assist in preparing for unexpected emergencies and retirement, such as—

(A) raising the starting point for the 28 percent personal income tax bracket by $10,000 over 5 years;

(B) excluding from income the first $500 in interest and dividend income ($250 for singles);

(C) exempting from capital gains taxation the first $5,000 in capital gains taxes; and

(D) raising the deductible limit for Individual Retirement Account contributions from $2,000 to $3,000; and

(2) tax relief as described in this subsection is fully achievable within the parameters set forth under this budget resolution.

CHAFEE AMENDMENTS NOS. 235–237

Mr. DOMENICI (for Mr. CHAFEE) proposed three amendments to the concurrent resolution, S. Con. Res. 20, supra; as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 235

On page 3, line 10, increase the amount by $3,717,000,000.

On page 3, line 11, increase the amount by $26,559,000,000.

On page 3, line 12, increase the amount by $16,152,000,000.

On page 3, line 13, increase the amount by $24,590,000,000.

On page 3, line 14, increase the amount by $31,319,000,000.

On page 3, line 15, increase the amount by $54,638,000,000.

On page 3, line 16, increase the amount by $67,877,000,000.

On page 3, line 17, increase the amount by $75,346,000,000.

On page 3, line 18, increase the amount by $88,598,000,000.

On page 4, line 5, increase the amount by $3,717,000,000.

On page 4, line 6, increase the amount by $26,559,000,000.

On page 4, line 7, increase the amount by $16,152,000,000.

On page 4, line 8, increase the amount by $24,590,000,000.

On page 4, line 9, increase the amount by $31,319,000,000.

On page 4, line 10, increase the amount by $54,638,000,000.

On page 4, line 11, increase the amount by $67,877,000,000.

On page 4, line 12, increase the amount by $75,346,000,000.

On page 4, line 13, increase the amount by $88,598,000,000.

On page 4, line 18, decrease the amount by $83,000,000.

On page 4, line 19, decrease the amount by $783,000,000.

On page 4, line 20, decrease the amount by $1,946,000,000.

On page 4, line 21, decrease the amount by $3,057,000,000.

On page 4, line 22, decrease the amount by $4,616,,000,000.

On page 4, line 23, decrease the amount by $6,699,000,000.

On page 4, line 24, decrease the amount by $10,401,000,000.

On page 4, line 25, decrease the amount by $14,557,000,000.

On page 5, line 1, decrease the amount by $19,436,000,000.

On page 5, line 6, decrease the amount by $83,000,000.

On page 5, line 7, decrease the amount by $783,000,000.

On page 5, line 8, decrease the amount by $1,946,000,000.

On page 5, line 9, decrease the amount by $3,057,000,000.

On page 5, line 10, decrease the amount by $4,616,000,000.

On page 5, line 11, decrease the amount by $6,966,000,000.

On page 5, line 12, decrease the amount by $10,401,000,000.

On page 5, line 13, decrease the amount by $14,557,000,000.

On page 5, line 14, decrease the amount by $19,436,000,000.

On page 5, line 19, increase the amount by $3,800,000,000.

On page 5, line 20, increase the amount by $27,342,000,000.

On page 5, line 21, increase the amount by $18,098,000,000.

On page 5, line 22, increase the amount by $27,647,000,000.

On page 5, line 23, increase the amount by $35,935,000,000.

On page 5, line 24, increase the amount by $61,604,000,000.

On page 5, line 25, increase the amount by $78,278,000,000.

On page 6, line 1, increase the amount by $89,903,000,000.

On page 6, line 2, increase the amount by $108,034,000,000.

On page 6, line 6, decrease the amount by $3,800,000,000.

On page 6, line 7, decrease the amount by $31,142,000,000.

On page 6, line 8, decrease the amount by $49,240,000,000.

On page 6, line 9, decrease the amount by $76,887,000,000.

On page 6, line 10, decrease the amount by $112,822,000,000.

On page 6, line 11, decrease the amount by $174,426,000,000.

On page 6, line 12, decrease the amount by $252,704,000,000.

On page 6, line 13, decrease the amount by $342,607,000,000.

On page 6, line 14, decrease the amount by $450,641,000,000.

On page 6, line 18, decrease the amount by $3,800,000,000.

On page 6, line 19, decrease the amount by $31,142,000,000.

On page 6, line 20, decrease the amount by $49,240,000,000.

On page 6, line 21, decrease the amount by $76,887,000,000.

On page 6, line 22, decrease the amount by $112,822,000,000.

On page 6, line 23, decrease the amount by $174,426,000,000.

On page 6, line 24, decrease the amount by $252,704,000,000.

On page 6, line 25, decrease the amount by $342,607,000,000.

On page 7, line 1, decrease the amount by $450,641,000,000.

On page 37, line 2, decrease the amount by $83,000,000.

On page 37, line 3, decrease the amount by $83,000,000.

On page 37, line 6, decrease the amount by $783,000,000.

On page 37, line 7, decrease the amount by $783,000,000.

On page 37, line 10, decrease the amount by $1,946,000,000.

On page 37, line 11, decrease the amount by $1,946,000,000.

On page 37, line 14, decrease the amount by $3,057,000,000.

On page 37, line 15, decrease the amount by $3,057,000,000.

On page 37, line 18, decrease the amount by $4,616,000,000.

On page 37, line 19, decrease the amount by $4,616,000,000.

On page 37, line 22, decrease the amount by $6,966,000,000.

On page 37, line 23, decrease the amount by $6,966,000,000.

On page 38, line 2, decrease the amount by $10,401,000,000.

On page 38, line 3, decrease the amount by $10,401,000,000.

On page 38, line 6, decrease the amount by $14,557,000,000.

On page 38, line 7, decrease the amount by $14,557,000,000.

On page 38, line 10, decrease the amount by $19,436,000,000.

On page 38, line 11, decrease the amount by $19,436,000,000.

On page 42, line 2, strike the amount and insert ''$71,016,000,000''.

On page 42, line 4, strike the amount and insert ''$388,791,000,000''.

On page 42, line 16, strike the amount and insert ''$71,016,000,000''.

On page 42, line 18, strike the amount and insert ''$388,791,000,000''.

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON THE IMPORTANCE OF SOCIAL SECURITY FOR INDIVIDUALS WHO BECOME DISABLED.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) in addition to providing retirement income, Social Security also protects individuals from the loss of income due to disability;

(2) according to the most recent report from the Social Security Board of Trustees nearly 1 in 7 Social Security beneficiaries, 6,000,000 individuals in total, were receiving benefits as a result of disability;

(3) more than 60 percent of workers have no long-term disability insurance protection other than that provided by Social Security;

(4) according to statistics from the Society of Actuaries, the odds of a long-term disability versus death are 2.7 to 1 at age 27, 3.5 to 1 at age 42, and 2.2 to 1 at age 52; and

(5) in 1998, the average monthly benefit for a disabled worker was $722.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that levels in the resolution assume that—

(1) Social Security plays a vital role in providing adequate income for individuals who become disabled;

(2) individuals who become disabled face circumstances much different than those who rely on Social Security for retirement income;

(3) Social Security reform proposals that focus too heavily on retirement income may adversely affect the income protection provided to individuals with disabilities; and

(4) Congress and the President should take these factors into account when considering proposals to reform the Social Security program.

CHAFEE (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 238

Mr. DOMENICI (for Mr. CHAFEE for himself, Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. FEINGOLD, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. MOYNIHAN, Mr. ROTH, Mr. ALLARD, Ms. COLLINS, and Ms. SNOWE) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution, S. Con. Res. 20, supra; as follows:

On page 15, line 8, increase the amount by $200,000,000.

On page 15, line 9, increase the amount by $200,000,000.

On page 18, line 15, decrease the amount by $200,000,000.

On page 18, line 16, decrease the amount by $200,000,000.

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3____. SENSE OF THE SENATE CONCERNING FUNDING FOR THE LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) amounts in the land and water conservation fund finance the primary Federal program for acquiring land for conservation and recreation and for supporting State and local efforts for conservation and recreation;

(2) Congress has appropriated only $10,000,000,000 out of the more than $21,000,000,000 covered into the fund from revenues payable to the United States under the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1331 et seq.); and

(3) 38 Senators cosigned 2 letters to the Chairman and Ranking Member of the Committee on the Budget urging that the land and water conservation fund be fully funded.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution and legislation enacted pursuant to this resolution assume that Congress should appropriate $200,000,000 for fiscal year 2000 to provide financial assistance to the States under section 6 of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 (16 U.S.C 460*l*–8), in addition to such amounts as are made available for Federal land acquisition under that Act for fiscal year 2000.

ASHCROFT AMENDMENT NO. 239

Mr. DOMENICI (for Mr. ASHCROFT) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution, S. Con. Res. 20, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. . SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT THE SOCIAL SECURITY TRUST FUND SHALL BE MANAGED IN THE BEST INTEREST OF CURRENT AND FUTURE BENEFICIARIES.

It is the sense of the Senate that the Social Security Trust Fund surplus shall be invested in interest-bearing obligations of the United States in a manner consistent with the best interest of, and payment of benefits to, current and future Social Security beneficiaries.

ASHCROFT AMENDMENT NO. 240

Mr. DOMENICI (for Mr. ASHCROFT) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution, S. Con. Res. 20, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. . SENSE OF THE SENATE CONCERNING FEDERAL TAX RELIEF.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate makes the following findings:

(1) The Congressional Budget Office has reported that payroll taxes will exceed income taxes for 74 percent of all taxpayers in 1999.

(2) The federal government will collect nearly $50 billion in income taxes this year through its practice of taxing the income Americans sacrifice to the government in the form of social security payroll taxes.

(3) American taxpayers are currently shouldering the heaviest tax burden since 1944.

(4) According to the non-partisan Tax Foundation, the median dual-income family sacrificed a record 37.6 percent of its income to the government in 1997.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the assumptions underlying the functional totals in this resolution assume that a significant portion of the tax relief will be devoted to working families who are double-taxed by—

(1) providing taxpayers with an above-the-line income tax deduction for the social security payroll taxes they pay so that they no longer pay income taxes on such payroll taxes, and/or

(2) gradually reducing the lowest marginal income tax rate from 15 percent to 10 percent, and/or

(3) other tax reductions that do not reduce the tax revenue devoted to the social security trust fund.

GRASSLEY AMENDMENT NO. 241

Mr. DOMENICI (for Mr. GRASSLEY) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution, S. Con. Res. 20, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert:

SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING THE CLOSURE OF HOWARD AIR FORCE BASE AND REPOSITIONING OF ASSETS AND OPERATIONAL CAPABILITIES IN FORWARD OPERATING LOCATIONS.

(A) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds the following—

(1) at noon on the last day of 1999, the Panama Canal and its adjacent lands will revert from U.S. control to that of the government of Panama, as prescribed by the Cater-Torrijos treaties concluded in 1978.

(2) with this act, nearly ninety years of American presence in the Central American isthmus will come to an end.

(3) on September 25, 1998, the United States and Panama announced that talks aimed at establishing a Multinational Counter-narcotics Center (MCC) were ended through mutual agreement. The two countries had been engaged in discussions for two years.

(4) plans to meet the deadline are going forward and the U.S. is withdrawing all forces and proceeding with the return of all military installations to Panamanian control.

(5) Howard Air Force Base is scheduled to return to Panamanian control by May 1, 1999. Howard AFB provides a secure staging for detection, monitoring and intelligence collecting assets on counter-narcotics drug trafficking. Howard Air Force Base was the proposed location for the Multinational Counter-narcotics Center.

(6) AWACS (E–3) aircraft used for counter-drug surveillance is scheduled for relocation from Howard AFB to MacDill AFB in April. The E3's are scheduled to resume this mission in May from MacDill.

(7) USSOUTHCOM and the Department of State have been examining the potential for

alternative forward operating locations (FOLs). A potential location would require the operational capacity to house E–3 AWACS KC–135 tankers, Night Hawk F–16s/F–15s, Navy P–3s, U.S. Customs P–3s and Citations, Army Airborne Reconnaissance Low, and Senior Scout C–130s. No agreement has been reached regarding the number of FOLs required, cost of relocating these assets, time to build ensuing facilities, or plans for housing these assets for long-term stays.

(B) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the provisions of this resolution assume that—

(1) the United States is obligated to protect its citizens from the threats posed by illegal drugs crossing our borders. Interdiction in the transit and arrival zones disrupt the drug flow, increases risk to traffickers, drives them to less efficient routes and methods, and prevents significant amounts of drugs from reaching the United States.

(2) there has been an inordinate delay in identifying and securing appropriate alternate sites.

(3) the Senate must pursue every effort to explore, urge the President to arrange long-term agreements with countries that support reducing the flow of drugs, and fully fund forward operating locations so that we continue our balanced strategy of attacking drug smugglers before their deadly cargos reach our borders.

ASHCROFT (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 242

Mr. DOMENICI (for Mr. ASHCROFT for himself, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. GORTON, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. BOND, Mr. GREGG, and Mr. HELMS) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution, S. Con. Res. 20, supra; as follows:

On page 73, after line 10, insert the following:

(c) ADDITIONAL FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Children should be the primary beneficiaries of education spending, not bureaucrats.

(2) Parents have the primary responsibility for their children's education. Parents are the first and best educators of their children. Our Nation trusts parents along with teachers and State and local school officials to make the best decisions about the education of our Nation's children.

(3) Congress supports the goal of ensuring that the maximum amount of Federal education dollars are spent directly in the classrooms.

(4) Education initiatives should boost academic achievement for all students. Excellence in American classrooms means having high expectations for all students, teachers, and administrators, and holding schools accountable to the children and parents served by such schools.

(5) Successful schools and school systems are characterized by parental involvement in the education of their children, local control, emphasis on basic academics, emphasis on fundamental skills, and exceptional teachers in the classroom.

(6) Congress rejects a one-size-fits-all approach to education which often creates barriers to innovation and reform initiatives at the local level. America's rural schools face challenges quite different from their urban counterparts. Parents, teachers, and State and local school officials should have the freedom to tailor their education plans and reforms according to the unique educational needs of their children.

(7) The funding levels in this resolution assume that Congress will provide an additional $2,800,000,000 for fiscal year 2000 and an additional $33,000,000,000 for the period beginning with fiscal year 2000 and ending with fiscal year 2005 for elementary and secondary education.

(d) ADDITIONAL SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution assume that—

(1) increased Federal funding for elementary and secondary education should be directed to States and local school districts; and

(2) decisionmaking authority should be placed in the hands of States, localities, and families to implement innovative solutions to local educational challenges and to increase the performance of all students, unencumbered by unnecessary Federal rules and regulations.

HUTCHISON AMENDMENT NO. 243

Mr. DOMENICI (for Mrs. HUTCHISON) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution, S. Con, Res. 20, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert:

It is the sense of the Senate that a task force be created for the purpose creating a reserve fund for natural disasters. The Task Force should be composed of three Senators appointed by the majority leader, and two Senators appointed by the minority leader. The task force should also be composed of three members appointed by the Speaker of the House, and two members appointed by minority leader in the House.

It is the sense of the Senate that the task force make a report to the appropriate committees in Congress within 90 days of being convened. The report should be available for the purposes of consideration during comprehensive overhaul of budget procedures

MOYNIHAN AMENDMENT NO. 244

Mr. DOMENICI (for Mr. MOYNIHAN) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution, S. Con. Res. 20, supra; as follows:

On page 71, strike lines 3 through 7.

NOTICES OF HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Committee on Small Business will hold a hearing entitled ''Buried Alive: Small Business Consumed by Tax Filing Burdens.'' The hearing will be held on Monday, April 12, 1999, beginning at 1:00 p.m. in room 428A of the Russell Senate Office Building.

The hearing will be broadcast live on the Internet from our homepage address http://www.senate.gov/sbc

For further information, please contact Mark Warren at 224–5175.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the information of the Senate and the public that a hearing has been scheduled before the Full Committee on Energy and Natural Resources. The purpose of this hearing is to receive testimony on S. 501, a bill to address resource management issues in Glacier Bay National Park, Alaska; S. 698, a bill to review the suitability and feasibility of recovering costs of high altitude rescues at Denali National Park and Preserve in Alaska, and for other purposes; S. 711, to allow for the investment of joint Federal and State funds from the civil settlement of damages from the *Exxon Valdez* oil spill, and for other purposes; and two bills I will be introducing today, a bill to improve Native hiring and contracting by the Federal Government within the State of Alaska, and for other purposes; and bill to provide for the continuation of higher education through the conveyance of certain lands in the State of Alaska to the University of Alaska, and for other purposes.

The hearing will take place on Thursday, April 15, 1999 at 9:30 p.m. in room SD–366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building in Washington, DC.

Because of the limited time available for the hearing, witnesses may testify by invitation only. However, those wishing to submit written testimony for the hearing record should send two copies of their testimony to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, United States Senate, SD–364, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Washington, DC 20510–6150.

For further information, please contact Jim O'Toole or Shawn Taylor of the committee staff at (202) 224–6969.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the information of the Senate and the public that a hearing has been scheduled before the Subcommittee on National Parks, Historic Preservation, and Recreation of the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources. The purpose of this hearing is to receive testimony on S. 109, a bill to improve protection and management of the Chattahoochee River National Recreation Area in the State of Georgia; S. 340, a bill to amend the Cache La Poudre River Corridor Act to make technical corrections, and for other purposes; S. 582, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to enter into an arrangement for the construction and operation of the Gateway Visitor Center at Independence National Historical Park; S. 589, a bill to require the National Park Service to undertake a study of the Loess Hills Area in western Iowa to review options for the protection and interpretation of the area's natural, cultural, and historical resources; S. 591, a bill to authorize a feasibility study for the preservation of the Loess Hills in western Iowa; and H.R. 149, a bill to make technical corrections to the Omnibus Parks and Public Lands Management Act of 1996 and to other laws related to parks and public lands.

The hearing will take place on Thursday, April 15, 1999 at 2:00 p.m. in room SD–366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building in Washington, DC.

Because of the limited time available for the hearing, witnesses may testify by invitation only. However, those wishing to submit written testimony for the hearing record should send two